

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH IN CHRISTIAN HISTORY

WILHELM PAUCK, *University of Chicago*

It is customary to describe and interpret the history of Christianity as church history. To be sure, most church historians do not emphasize the special importance of the "church" in the Christian life they study and analyse; indeed, they deal with the idea of the church, with ecclesiological doctrines and with ecclesiastical practices as if they represented special phases of the Christian life. But, nevertheless, the fact that all aspects of Christian history are subsumed under the name and title of the "church" indicates that the character of Christianity is held to be inseparable from that of the "church"; the very custom of regarding Christian history as church history indicates that the Christian mind is marked by a special kind of self-consciousness induced by the awareness that the Christian faith is not fully actualized unless it is expressed in the special social context suggested by the term "church."

The tendency of many people, whether they are friendly or unfriendly to the Christian faith, to distinguish between the faith and the "church" is a sign of Christian weakness, for actually it is impossible to be a Christian believer apart from the social reality of the "church." When this connection is denied by the attempt to treat the Christian religion as if it could be held as a "philosophy of life," which merely determines a person's outlook or shapes his inwardness, Christianity is not really actualized. The same judgment must be passed on all those who, though they may wish to be regarded as Christians, desire to be relieved from all responsibility for the church in which they were raised or within whose range of activity they live.

The history of the Christian people proves that there never was a living faith in Christ apart from the "church." It is therefore only as it should be that the history of Christianity is treated as the history of the "church." However, the insight that there can be no Christian faith apart from the church has come to many modern Protestants as a new discovery. When they discuss today the responsibility of Christians for the character of civilization, they stress the duties which they must fulfill as members of the "church." Indeed, they speak of our own Christian era as "the age of the church." In the perspective of Christian history, the claims advanced in this connection are unjustifiable, for all periods of Christian life have been "ages of the church."

The re-discovery of the "church" in our time means that the mission of Christianity, which in all ages of history has been carried out in terms of the "church," is being re-conceived. Strictly speaking, the "church" is not being re-discovered, but the function of the "church" is being re-defined and the idea of the "church" is being re-thought.

This re-orientation of contemporary Protestantism is due to several factors in our common life: Christians have come to realize that even in the nations which are regarded as Christian, they represent no longer a majority but a minority. Face to face with this fact, they have been compelled to understand themselves again, like their predecessors of old, as a "peculiar people." The open hostility of such powerful movements as National Socialism and Communism toward the Christian religion has forced them into a defensive position, making it necessary for them to examine their resources and to test their convictions. The fact that Christians living in nominally Christian lands could be exposed to persecution has awakened Christian people all over the world to the danger with which secularistic movements and other so-called "alternatives to the Christian gospel" threaten them. The reformation of the Christian life which the ecumenical enterprise has come to demand of Protestant people in the face of the disintegration of western civilization is therefore everywhere acknowledged as a duty which Christians must fulfill. The need for Christian unity, which was first aroused in connection with the work of foreign missions and finally was made glaringly apparent by the failure of the Christian churches to prevent the first world war, has now become the cause around which Christian people rally all over the world. Moreover, the division of western Christianity into Roman Catholicism and Protestantism which blocks the achievement of a universal Christian unity has rendered Protestants and Catholics highly conscious of their own respective traditions. The rapprochement of the several Protestant groups and churches toward one another which has resulted from the activities of the ecumenical movement has caused them to re-examine their legacies and to break through the isolationism of their denominational sectarianism.

Thus the whole life of contemporary Protestantism is loosened up and everywhere people search for a fresh understanding of the distinctive functions and mission of the Christian church. This is why the concern for the idea of the church has become so prominent in contemporary Protestantism.

In view of this situation, a review of the main phases of the interpretation of the idea of the church in the course of Christian history should prove to be instructive.

I

The word "church" (as well as its equivalents "*Kirk*," "*Kirche*," etc.) is an early medieval derivation from the Greek *kyriakon* or *kyriaka*, meaning "that which belongs to the Lord," first applied (most probably by Arian Goths) to the place of worship. The most common modern usage of the word, in so far as it refers either to the building where people gather for divine services or to the worship itself, is therefore a preservation of its original or earliest significance. That this same word "church" is also the translation of the Greek word *ekklēsia*, by which the early Christians described themselves as a special community, gives great cause of regret to many who desire that the suggestiveness of the original Christian word might have been preserved in the Germanic tongues. (The Latins adopted the Greek word unchanged, *ecclesia*, and in the Roman languages it has been preserved to this day, as in the French *église*, for example). As a translation of *ekklēsia*, the word "church" should mean a specially convoked people, and not merely the place in which they gather, or the act of worship for which they assemble. When the word "church" signifies "congregation" the original meaning of the Greek word *ekklēsia* is closely alluded to. For in the profane Greek the word, which, by the way, was not a common one, meant an assembly of properly convoked citizens (i. e. convened by the call of a herald). The New Testament usage of the word *ekklēsia* was inspired by the Septuagint, whose translators rendered the phrases of the Old Testament that referred to the people of Israel assembled in the presence of God and as such representing the people of God, his chosen nation, namely *Qahal Israel* or *Qahal Jahveh*, into the Greek *ekklēsia*, distinguishing it from *synagoge* (synagogue), the worshiping congregation.

When the early Christians applied¹ this name to themselves they expressed thereby the claim to be the true Israel (Gal. 6, 16; Rom. 9, 6; Acts 2, 9; Hebr. 2, 16), God's own people (II Cor. 6, 18; I Pet. 2, 9; Acts. 1, 6) in whom the Messianic promises given by God to Israel had been fulfilled. For they knew themselves as belonging to Jesus Christ, the Messiah and Lord, in whom God had revealed himself. The word *ekklēsia* referred to the whole community of believers in Christ as well as to individual local Christian fellowships. It signified always the Messianic Christian people who in proclaiming by word and deed the good news of the saving event of the Lordship of Jesus Christ were the chosen people of God.

Whether Jesus ever intended to found such a fellowship cannot be determined. The gospels, in so far as they are read as historical records, do not permit definite conclusions. The discussion of the

meaning of the passages which report pronouncements on the *ekklesia* out of the mouth of Jesus, remains today as undecided as it ever was. It is doubtful that they are authentic words of Jesus. Even if one assumes that Jesus himself regarded the group of the twelve disciples as a Messianic fellowship, the Roman Catholic interpretation especially of Mt. 16, 18 ("Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my church," etc.) suggesting that Jesus established the church, the *ekklesia*, on the supremacy of Peter and on apostolic succession, is utterly implausible.

It cannot be denied, of course, that Jesus called a new people into being, but as far as the beginnings of the Christian church can be historically interpreted, it was constituted as such only after his death. Then his followers set themselves apart from the Jewish community by the confession: Jesus, the crucified and risen one, is the Christ! They established themselves as the messianic people by the Christ-cult. Fashioned after Jewish patterns, it was centered in the sacramental ceremonies of Baptism and the Lord's Supper in which the communion with Christ was celebrated. It inspired them to a common life of eschatological expectancy and of love communism (Acts 4). By the new morality of fellowship in the Holy Spirit (*koinonia*), by brotherhood and mutual service in the name of Christ, this people of God separated itself further from the Jewish congregation.

It was Paul's most significant achievement that while he carried the gospel of God's saving revelation in Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, he fully established the new Messianic fellowship apart from Judaism and other religions as well. He too called it "*ekklesia* of God" or "God's Israel." The theme of his preaching and teaching was that as Jesus Christ was the fulfiller of history, his *ekklesia* was the center of history, the people among whom all life would be fulfilled. He interpreted the church as a fellowship of eschatological hope and as a spiritual reality of mystical, sacramental salvation: through the holy spirit by which Jesus the Christ exercises the *basileia*, all men of faith, Jews and Gentiles alike, are drawn into the new mankind, the ferment of the world's history. The believers in Christ are now what formerly the Jews as the people of the law claimed to be (Gal. 3, 28). The church is also a mystical unity permeated by the healing presence of the eternal Christ and the holy spirit. In this sense it is the body of Christ and all its members are members of this body (I Cor. 12, 12ff., Rom. 12, 4ff.). In the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper they share the body and the blood of Christ (I Cor. 10. 16ff.), dying in him to the law, sin, death and the demonic powers and rising in him to victory over all that estranges men from God. Paul's conviction that this *ecclesia*, because it was found-

ed upon the lordship of the crucified and risen Christ, fulfilled both the Jewish search for true morality and the Greek quest for true knowledge, expressing this fulfillment in *agape* (I Cor. 13), was most revolutionary. Thereby he anticipated the essential meaning of the later Logos-Christology and endowed the Christian church for its entire future with the dynamic claim of world transformation.

To be sure, Paul's vision far excelled his capacity to translate these ideas into actuality. Partly because of his eschatological enthusiasm and partly on account of his dependence upon traditional Jewish moral codes, but probably also because of the lack of other practical possibilities, he advised his fellow-Christians to maintain conservative attitudes toward the social order (loyalty to state, marriage, slavery, etc.). However, the fellowship of the Christians among themselves must have been determined by a new spirit of devotion for one another. Paul's letters and the apostolic and post-apostolic writings clearly exhibit a love ethic which was conditioned by the fundamental Christian beliefs. It rendered the group life of the *ecclesiae* radically different from the standards of the ancient world, although their outward forms closely resembled those of Jewish synagogues, Hellenistic cultic associations and even secular fraternities.

The worship and moral group life of the early church was at first inspired by a spontaneous immediacy of spiritual enthusiasm kept aflame by the certain expectation of the imminent reappearance of the Lord. But the inevitable abatement of these excitements and the increasing differentiation of the Christian groups from others, necessitated by the growing hostility of the surrounding world, gradually caused the emergence of definite institutional features of organization.

The early ecclesiastical offices exhibit an imitation of various local traditions and a dependence upon suggestions by apostolic church founders. From Judaism the Christians adopted the custom of making the elders the leaders of the congregations, but, for a long time, the congregations, acting as a body, regulated their own affairs with the consciousness of being led by the spirit under the leadership of Christ in unity with the church spread throughout the world. In a long historical process the monarchical episcopate was formed, guaranteeing unity of belief and order of religious service (Ignatius), guarding by virtue of "apostolic succession" the purity of Christian teachings contained in the "apostolic" norms of the New Testament Canon and the Creed (the anti-Gnostic fathers), exercising moral supervision through the discipline of penance (Calixtus, Cyprian). Ultimately it assumed the character of priesthood, (Cyprian), mediating salvation through the sacraments from God to the people. The

sanctity of the church, which in the beginnings had been manifested in the "sinlessness" of individual members and which therefore consisted in the Christian-moral character of personal relations, was more and more transferred to the impersonal functions of the ritual, the sacraments and the priestly office. Protests against this process were frequent and violent (Montanism, Novatianism, Donatism), but in vain; the leaders of the church began to make that distinction between the empirical and ideal church and between true and untrue Christians which was to determine the ecclesiological teachings throughout the ages to come.

The writings of Tertullian, Irenaeus and Cyprian show that in their time the transformation of the church from the fellowship of converts, who had the triumphant sense of mission to be the people of God's Messiah, to an institution of salvation of a sacramental hierarchical character was practically complete. The earlier personal relationship marked by spiritual fervor and moral renewal was replaced by membership in an institution of salvation which claimed to possess the only supernatural means of redemption and the absolute, unchangeable truth. The later inner development of this institution was largely marked by the efforts to extend the salvation which it claimed to mediate into all spheres of human life between birth and death. The consolidation of the hierarchy, the multiplication of the sacraments, and the establishment of orthodox doctrine, which are the general features of the inner history of Roman Catholicism from the middle of the second century until the Vatican Council of 1870, represent an amazingly consistent unfolding of principles which the early church invented in order to maintain its own identity against foes from within and without.

By the twofold attitude of defense (against the hostility of the disintegrating Roman society and its dictatorial rulers) and of adjustment (to the social, economic, and cultural conditions of its environment) the church, in becoming more and more an organized "divine society," succeeded in preserving the claim of its first believers: to be the true people of God. With respect to this sense of mission it acknowledged no divided allegiance. The decline of the personal affiliation of its members to one another, the separation of the laity from the clergy, the complicated and in their abstractness often unintelligible forms of ecclesiastical theology, the compromise with the standards of the un-Christian world, the introduction of the struggle for political power into its body—all these incisive changes never extinguished the belief first expressed in the *Pastor Hermae* that because "the world was made for the church," in the church the purpose of the world was disclosed.¹ This is the chief reason why the sacred institution, in spite of the lack of prophetic initiative, never

lost the incentive to life—and world-transformation. Neither the secularism of which it early became a victim, nor the asceticism in which its world-critical radicalism was hid, could destroy its consciousness of being the only true instrument of divine salvation. The church historian is again and again confronted by the paradoxical fact that even personally immoral or despicably lewd representatives of the church advanced its claims for world leadership and that a world-denying monasticism repeatedly became the source of world transformation.

Irenaeus understood the church to be a sacred institution, grounded in the episcopate, which by virtue of apostolic succession possesses and preserves the divine truth and which administers divine salvation through the sacraments. Of this church he said: "In the church God has placed the universal operation of the spirit; all those who do not belong to the church cannot be his (the Spirit's) participants. . . . for where the church is there is also the spirit of God, and where the spirit of God is there is the church and all grace."²

Cyprian found the contradiction between the religious-moral ideal of the holy church and the actual moral conditions in the Christian congregations intolerable. He came, also, to regard it as impossible that the church's spiritual character could be founded on the participation of individual Christians with Christ. He therefore defined the "hierarchical" church as the "mother" of every Christian on which he is dependent for his relation to God in Christ and which is therefore transcendently set before him. This church is constituted in the episcopate which is the bearer of the spirit, the guarantee of church unity, and the priestly mediation of sacramental salvation. No one can hope to obtain salvation unless he submits to and conforms with this church.³

The marks (*notae*) of this church which were gradually defined and which characterize it to this day in the eyes of all representatives of a Catholic Christianity were, significantly enough, present in the thought of the early Christian leaders of the post-apostolic age: 1) It is the pillar and foundation of truth;⁴ 2) It is one (in the sense of exclusive uniqueness);⁵ 3) It is *holy*, a holy people;⁶ 4) It is catholic, i.e. universal, spread through the entire world;⁷ 5) It is eternal;⁸ 6) It is apostolic.⁹

II

Two thinkers of the ancient church must be singled out because of their interpretations of the idea of the church: Origen and Augustine.

Origen called the church an "assembly of all saints" (*coetus omnium sanctorum*). As such it is the *civitas Dei*, the divine state or *polis*, which will gradually penetrate the whole Roman Empire. When

the Logos will rule in the hearts of all men, having taught them the doctrine of man's true spiritual destiny and the way of peace, the church will be the divine world-state and constitute the true cosmos in the world (*kosmos tou kosmou*).¹⁰

These ideas signify the replacement of the old catastrophic eschatology by a philosophy of development and the substitution for the early Christian antagonism to the state and the orders of the world of a friendly appreciation of Graeco-Roman civilization. (Origen praised the *pax Romana* for having unified mankind and thus furnished the conditions for the penetration of civilization by Christian doctrine and morality!). The church was now understood as the community of holy spiritual persons, i.e. those whose lives are inwardly shaped by the spiritual knowledge (*gnosis*), because they carry the dominion of the Lord (the Kingdom of God) within them. It is important to emphasize this personalism not only in order to contrast it with the institutionalization of the church that was commencing in Origen's day, but also in order to recognize it as an early suggestion of what was later to become an outstanding feature of the Eastern-Orthodox Church: an ecclesiology which defines the church as the society of those who possess the knowledge of the divine mysteries as they are rendered visible in the liturgy and the cult, thus becoming the means of a transfiguration of the world.

Augustine presents a theology of the church which is unrivalled among the ancient theologians both by its exhaustiveness and suggestiveness. In his interpretation of Christianity he combined a profound personal religiousness with a broad readiness to submit obediently to historical authority and tradition. He was aware of the fact that what men live by is made available to them by historical tradition and in objective historical institutions. He was therefore willing to acknowledge the authority of the church as the primary datum on which the Christian life depended. "I should not have believed the gospel," he said, "if the authority of the Catholic Church had not compelled me to do so."¹¹ This strange combination of an implicit and explicit faith is reflected in his entire theology, but particularly in his interpretation of the idea of the church.

He summed up the entire previous development of the church idea by his anti-Donatist justification of the one, holy, catholic, apostolic, sacramental—hierarchical institution of salvation, the authority of which rests upon the objective impersonal validity of Word and sacrament and upon its historically attested power. But he deepened this church concept by the assertion that he only is a true member of the universal body of Christ who practices the spirit of love (*caritas*) thereby giving evidence of the illumination by the Holy Spirit and of the renewal of life by the Grace of Christ. *Caritas* alone constitutes

true church-membership, not the use of the sacraments; but only by means of the sacraments can one receive the possibility of obtaining *caritas* from the spirit of Christ.

In other words, the church is seen from two points of view: it is outwardly maintained by the sacraments instituted by Christ; it is inwardly inspired by the spirit of love which Christ infuses into the hearts of believers.

Under the latter aspect Augustine stressed the nature of the church as a social community. He called it a "congregation and society of men in which brotherly love is at work;"¹² a "universal society of saints and believers;"¹³ the "Christian society;"¹⁴ the "social life of the saints;"¹⁵ the "all-inclusive redeeming society, i.e. the congregation and society of the saints."¹⁶ In all these terms features of the church were suggested which in other contexts had marked the early Christian ecclesiology and which in another connection were to become prominent in the teaching of the Protestant Reformers.

The emphasis upon the community character of the church is also reflected in the phrase "communion of saints" (*communio sanctorum*) which was introduced into the Apostolic Creed during Augustine's time (although it is fully authenticated as part of the Creed only by Faustus of Reji, who died ca. 485).

This formula may mean "fellowship of the saints" as well as "communion (participation) in holy things" (*sancta=sacramenta!*). It may even refer to a communion with the saints (i.e. in heaven). All these interpretations were developed during the Middle Ages and they live on in the ecclesiology of the Roman Church of our day. But Augustine preferred the idea of the "fellowship of the saints" in so far as he regarded the *communio sacramentorum* as the means by which the *communio sanctorum* is made possible. Only the fellowship of love represents the true church. The visible, organized, sacramental church, apart from which this fellowship of holy persons cannot come into being, is always a "mixed body" (*corpus permixtum*) of saints and sinners, believers and unbelievers.

To these ideas, which were designed to overcome the conflict between two conceptions of the church (as the impersonal institution of redemption and as the personal fellowship of the redeemed who must act as agents of redemption), one must add the assertion which Augustine made under the influence of the teachings of Paul, namely that ultimately the true church is made up of the elect, the *numerus praedestinatorum*, i.e. the invisible number of those who, saved by virtue of God's mysterious act of predestination, have received the gift of perseverance (*donum perseverantiae*). At this point, all efforts to define and delimit the nature of the church must end—membership in it is hidden in the mystery of God's grace.

The actual church to which these ideas applied was the State-Church of the declining Roman Empire. During Augustine's own life-time, the Emperor Theodosius had declared Christianity the officially recognized religion of his realm. Earlier in the same century the church had been ostracised by the pre-Constantinian emperors as an enemy of the state. Now it became the cornerstone of public law and order. Conformity with its faith and discipline was now the guarantee of social-political morale and unity, and uniformity of its creed, discipline and organization was a political requirement.

The church was ready to assume the role which was thus assigned to it because, in the course of the centuries, it had grown to be an ecumenical organization patterned after the political structure of the Empire itself. It was divided into provinces which corresponded to those of the state and it was ruled by metropolitan patriarchs, archbishops and bishops whose power over the churches of the dioceses and synods equalled and sometimes exceeded that of the public officials who governed the same territories. The bishops of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Milan and other metropolitan centers were princes of the church whose prestige was as great politically as it was ecclesiastically. These developments were signs of the fact that the church was widely secularized when it accomplished its triumph over the Roman state and its pagan religions. Indeed, this secularization was largely the result of the absorption of Graeco-Roman civilization by the Christian religion as it had spread, despite persecution, throughout the regions of Europe, Africa and Asia, wherever the Romans ruled. But the adjustment to the cultural environment, by virtue of which Christianity had become a world-embracing religious-cultural organization, had never entailed the extinction of the church's sense of its special spiritual nature and mission. In the midst of secularization and paganization it preserved the awareness that it was founded on the event of Jesus Christ. The Trinitarian and Christological dogmas, the teachings on the nature of salvation, and particularly the cultus, gave expression to the church's faith in the supremacy of Christ over all gods, the superiority of Christianity over all religions and philosophies, and the fulfillment of all human yearnings for redemption in the hope for another world. The figure of Jesus Christ interpreted primarily by means of the Bible but also in terms of Greek philosophy and Hellenistic religiousness remained supreme.

It was this maintenance of Christocentrism in the midst of a syncretistic accommodation to the world which enabled the ancient Christian churches to outlive the disintegration of the Roman Empire. This Christocentrism was also the secret of its greatest historical accomplishment: the Christianization of the new European nations accompanied

by the transmission of the traditions of ancient civilization to them, which resulted gradually in the transformation of traditional ecclesiastical forms and customs according to the needs of the new cultural environment.

Augustine's doctrine of the church must be seen against the background of these conditions of the church of his time. His justification of the authority of the institutional church reflected the actual ecclesiastical situation, but his interpretation of the true church as a fellowship of love within this objective political-religious order, gave expression to the Christocentric dimension of faith and promise of life which, despite all concessions to secular culture, set Christianity apart from the temporal destinies of Greece and Rome.

That he himself thought along such lines is proved by his "*Divina Commedia*," the long and laborious treatise "*De civitate Dei*." He wrote it in response to the shock which had been felt through the Mediterranean world after Alaric and his Visigoths had sacked Rome, "the eternal city," in 410. Replying in particular to the criticism that the church had so enervated the Roman state that it could fall prey to the barbarians, he undertook to present a view of the church in the frame of a universal philosophy of history. He interpreted the history of mankind in the light of the interrelations and conflicts between two metaphysical systems of order: the *civitas terrena* as the society of the godless and the damned, and the *civitas Dei* as the communion of all saints. The Godstate is eternal and extends from the beginning to the end of history. It is to be fully disclosed at the end of time when the Kingdom, the reign of God, will be all in all. The historical church is not identical with this divine order but in so far as in it the *communio sanctorum* as the society of those who adhere to God can be and is being realized, it is the *civitas Dei* and the "living sacrifice" and the "living temple" of God.¹⁷ The institutional church is thus viewed as the historical manifestation of the eternal order of love. The vision of the immanence of this transcendent eternal order of good in the church was the climax of Augustine's ecclesiology. It enabled him to give expression to the conviction that by his faith the Christian is brought under the sway of an eternal society, the church, which, though it is imperfectly realized in history, is the true fountain of good in all social life and the end for which the world was created. What the early Christians had affirmed in the hope for the "heavenly Jerusalem" and what thinkers like Origen divined as the Christian fulfilment of Plato's political Utopia, Augustine summed up in his conception of the "city of God" as the *caelestis communio*. At the same time he provided the Christians of the future, both Catholics and Protestants, with a pattern of thought which was to inspire them to judge the historical churches in the light of an eternal church,

transcending all limitations of time and place and comprising within itself all who, filled with the spirit of God, are motivated by the love of God and men.

He met all arguments that the church was responsible for the fall of the Roman Empire by an interpretation of the state which corresponded to his view of the church. The state is the historical manifestation of the metaphysical "earthly city" just as the church is the social order in which the "heavenly city" is rendered visible. But the state lacks ultimate reality because it is motivated by the principle of evil while the church is the bearer of an eternal order of good which at the end of history is to be fully established in the triumph of God's creative goodness over all obstacles. Just as the historical church is not the "good society" itself but a "mixed body" of good and evil, the historical state is not an evil society as such, but the bearer of an ultimately negative principle and actually a mixed body of evil and good. All political life and order originate in the God-given social nature of man but all historical states are deformed by sin (*superbia*=egoistic pride) induced by the devil. The political life is marked by genuine social virtues (and Augustine did not hesitate to acknowledge the moral achievement especially of the Roman state!) but it is so infected by sin and evil that while it is built up it is at the same time doomed to ultimate destruction. The great empires may proceed to unify mankind, but this achievement cannot be a lasting one because in the end imperialism proves to be nothing but a *magnum latrocinium* (one great robbery). The actual nature of the state is such that it must render men *insociabiles* (ep. 91. 3). The ultimate hope of men lies therefore in no social-political order, in no man-made state or empire. It is to be found only in the "celestial communion" of the God-state. For this men must prepare themselves by membership in the historical institutional church. One of the primary functions of this church is the "right education of the human race" (*humanis generis recta eruditio*), i.e. guidance into a life of true social responsibility. To be sure, as long as history will last, the social life of men will be bound to political states; all states should, therefore, be brought under the sway of the church so that the good of the *civitas Dei* may be mediated to them. Thus men will be prepared also in the political activities for the sanctification and glorification which at the end of history will be made manifest in the Kingdom of God.

III

As if Augustine's vision had been realized, the leaders of the medieval church, following the example chiefly of Gregory I, called the church the Kingdom of God. This suggested that one believed the church to be a supernatural institution of divine origin and authority established in the midst of human society. From this view a program

of social action was derived by which all spheres of human life were drawn under the domination of the church. Henceforth, the building of a Christian civilization was regarded as tantamount to the establishment of the kingdom of God. In spite of profound differences of opinion concerning the character of this Kingdom, Christians of all ages down to the time of the American social gospel learned from the medieval church to envisage a Christian society under the auspices of the Kingdom of God.

In the Middle Ages, life was Christianized by means of the permeation of all spheres of personal and social existence with hierarchical controls and sacramental blessings. Christianization and incorporation in the sacred institutionalisms of the church were one and the same thing. This *Verkirchlichung* (ecclesiasticalization) was made historically possible by the following factors: the downfall of the Western Roman Empire under the impact of external assaults by Germanic tribes and the ensuing political and economic disintegration created a social-political vacuum in central and southern Italy. This vacuum was filled when the bishop of Rome assumed central authority in the old Roman domains, thereby becoming the heir of Roman universalism. Beginning with Gregory the Great, the popes extended it over the entire Latin church in the form of ecclesiastical supremacy. These ambitions were counteracted by the Holy Roman Emperors who, since Charlemagne, regarded themselves as the successors of the Christian Roman Emperors. But as the German Empire, like all other European states, depended for its unity primarily upon the church, it was possible for the popes, despite their conflict with the emperors, to shape all ecclesiastical life in such a way that gradually a universal Roman Catholicism came into being. The power of this church rested not only upon its inclusiveness, which it enhanced by brooking no rivals next to itself, but also upon the accomplishments of great and competent leadership with which a benign providence blessed it.

The *Verkirchlichung* of civilization, i.e. the injection of ecclesiastical influence into all phases of life, was accomplished in remarkable extensions of the institutional character of the church. We can here describe them only briefly. The papal office gradually succeeded in establishing itself as the central legislative, executive and jurisdictional government over a unified organization of bishoprics comprising local parishes. This papal church became closely integrated in the feudal order and economy. It was the largest land-owner; and it permitted ecclesiastical officials (bishops and abbots) to become feudal lords (just as the popes were the feudal overlords of central Italy, the *patrimonium Petri*.)¹⁸

All these developments tended to increase clericalism. In view

of this fact it was highly significant that monasticism was absorbed by the organized church as one of its integral parts, for the monks became the bearers of religious culture within the ecclesiastical-clerical institution. They deepened the life of the church not only as practitioners of devotion, asceticism and mysticism but also as conservators of religious, theological and cultural traditions, and as religious reformers.

What the church as a clerical-monastic institution represented spiritually was communicated to the people by the sacraments. In order that the people could be supplied and surrounded with the administration of grace throughout their lives from birth till death, the church increased the number of the sacraments from two to seven by adding to the biblical sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist those of Confirmation, Penance, Priestly Ordination, Marriage and Extreme Unction.

In view of the fact that the church occupied such a central and dominating position in medieval life, it is astonishing to note that its theologians hardly developed a specific doctrine of the church. The whole Christian life was so completely part and parcel of the church that it would have been incongruous to explain its nature in a specific ecclesiology. The scholastics dealt with it more or less directly in connection with the treatment of the sacrament of Ordination and in the context of the discussion of Christ as the head of the church (*caput gratiae*).¹⁹

It must suffice here to present the teaching of *Thomas Aquinas*. It was characteristic of him that also in his ecclesiology he combined Augustinian and Aristotelian categories, because in that way he could best do justice to the nature of the church as he knew it: the supernatural sacramental-hierarchical institution of salvation presided over by the successors of Peter, toward which all natural human social life is directed and in which it is fulfilled and perfected. The church, he taught, must be seen in connection with men's social nature. Because man is a "social and political animal" (*animal sociale et politicum*), his life must be so ordered that both his individual freedom and the social whole can be maintained. All members of society must be given the possibility of leading a virtuous life and of enjoying a sufficiency of physical goods (*sufficientia bonorum corporalium*). Each individual and group must, therefore, conform to the fundamental natural and positive laws so that the purpose of social life can be realized: the attainment of order (*ordo*) and happiness (*felicitas*), of peace (*pax*) and concord (*concordia*). It is the business of the political order (*magistrate*) to secure the obedience of these laws and to organize them in the state. But as the final destiny of man is the attainment of eternal bliss, for which all earthly happiness

is only a preparation, and because no true earthly happiness can be achieved unless its pursuit is grounded in the longing for eternal bliss, the state as the natural order of earthly concord and harmony must acknowledge its inferiority to the church, the supernatural body of Christ, by conformity to whose life man's end can be realized.

The church is thus defined as the "body of Christ" (*corpus Christi*). Its head is the incarnate God-man. He guides all men who are subject to him in the church, by "interior influence" (*interior influxus*) and "exterior government" (*exterior gubernatio*).²⁰ The former refers to the mystic renewal and completion of life by the power of grace through the sacrament. The latter is the actualization of Christ's supremacy in his example and the evangelical law. All those then who by the holy spirit have faith, grace and love (*caritas*) are members of the mystical body of Christ (*corpus Christi mysticum*). They are incorporated in an organism whose life is manifested in the sacraments administered by the priests *quasi Deo*.

In accordance with this interpretation of the church, Thomas could describe it also as the *congregatio fidelium*²¹ (the community of believers) and at the same time as the *congregatio politica* (an ordered community) in which superior guides (*rectores*), the clergymen, are set above their subjects (*subditi*), the lay-people.²² There can be no doubt that while Thomas did not neglect the social-religious fellowship character of the church (here he was under the influence of Augustine and possibly also under the spell of the monastic fellowship) he saw it primarily as an institutional community built on priesthood and sacraments and established in order and law. This judgment is supported by the fact that he defined the order of the church in terms of a scale of functions and authority which he had applied also to the state. It was later to become of great importance that in this connection (and, we may note, in recognition of actual circumstances) he interpreted the office of the pope as that of the father of all (*pater omnium*),²³ and as the "head of the whole church" (*caput totius ecclesiae*)²⁴ who exercises the "fullness of power over all ecclesiastical affairs" (*plenitudo potestatis super res ecclesiasticas*).²⁵

As such he has the right to make dogmatic decisions about the faith and even to formulate a new creed. By virtue of his office as the head of the church, he is also the bishop set over the entire church, possessing the power of immediate and direct rule (*regimen immediatum*) over the bishoprics on earth.²⁶ To be humbly subject to him is *de necessitate salutis* (necessary to salvation).²⁷

It is understandable that this ecclesiological teaching of Thomas Aquinas still guides the Roman Catholic Church. For modern Roman Catholicism consciously perpetuates the sacral institutionalism which the medieval Christians developed in dependence upon their

ancient heritage and in response to the historical opportunities of their own age. It still conceives the church as a supernatural and superpersonal reality which through the priestly administration of the sacraments reaches into the natural individual and social life of men, in order to supply them with a miraculous salvation and thus to prepare them for eternity. It still regards individual Christians as members of the church primarily in so far as they are the beneficiaries and recipients of its supernatural goods. The church is a community because it incorporates within itself all those who share in the divine priesthood of Jesus Christ. Only in a secondary and derived sense it is also a fellowship of Christians with one another. The church is therefore not a communion which is distinguished from other human societies and social relationships because its members are motivated by an unreserved mutual love for one another and for all men, but it is a supernatural order which, because of its superiority over all human societies, can claim the right to regulate them all, at least to such an extent that they must be prevented from undertaking anything which might hinder the church from ministering to its members. The church is not an organic community within the communal relationships. It is a divine miracle, namely the continued presence of Jesus Christ, the incarnate God, at work among men, healing them from the diseases of sin and from the imperfection of nature caused by sin and preparing them for a life of eternal bliss.

But the church, so conceived, is nevertheless an historical institution made and fashioned by men. Roman Catholics do not admit this fact in principle, for they claim that the church is ordered according to divine law which can be ascertained from the divinely inspired Bible and from the inerrant tradition of the church. But to a non-Roman Christian this must appear as an absolutization and divinization of relative historical decisions and developments. Indeed, he sees in the modern Roman Catholic church the arbitrarily restricted perpetuation of medieval Christianity made possible by the refusal of Roman Catholics to acknowledge that the sacramental-hierarchical form which the Christian church assumed during the Middle Ages was the result of the historical opportunities by which medieval Christians were confronted. They incorporated the legacy and tradition of the ancient church, which they considered as sacrosanct, in the feudalistic order characteristic of the first phase of the new European civilization. They were not conscious of the historical transformation which they effected in the life of Christianity and especially the church, for the sense of history which later was to mark the outlook of Western civilization was not yet developed in them. While they actually changed the ways of Christian faith and life, they were persuaded that they were loyal to an unchanging divine order. Because

they were supernaturalists they were able to regard this divine order as objectively given. That their supernaturalism was an outlook historically conditioned by the limitations of their knowledge did not and could not occur to them. They could not, therefore, also know that the sacramental-hierarchical organization of the church was an historical product of ancient Christian generations and not a supernatural creation of miraculous origin.

The understanding of the historical character of the medieval church-idea was made possible only by Luther's revolutionary re-conception of the Christian faith. When modern Roman Catholics consider the Protestant form of Christianity as a heresy they cling to the medieval idea of the church and arbitrarily preserve its historical form.

Actually, the Roman Catholic idea of the church and the institutions in which it was embodied did not go unchallenged in the Middle Ages. In the twelfth century, the Waldensians and Albigenses protested against the Roman hierarchalism and sacramentalism. They organized separate religious societies of their own, but they were ruthlessly suppressed. In the thirteenth century, members of the radical wing of the Franciscan movement violently criticized the secularization of the church which they attributed primarily to the clerical power. They cherished an ideal of the church that was inspired by the laws of apostolic poverty and they lived in the expectation of an Age of the Spirit when the church of priests was to be superseded by the church of the spirit. Then a fellowship of love, so they hoped, would replace hierarchical rule (Joachim de Fiore).

The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries witnessed the gradual dissolution of the church of the high Middle Ages. This disintegration was accompanied by religious and theological movements which tended to undermine the medieval church-idea. Under the impact of new cultural forces the universalism which the papal church had been able to nourish in the midst of feudalism particularism, declined. Nationalism raised its head. The towns emerged as new social communities. Individualism undermined the uniformity of medieval institutions. A new capitalistic money-economy practiced by industrial productivity and commercial activity began to attack the feudalistic rural economy based upon land-ownership and mutual services. The church found itself compelled to adjust itself to these new forces. In doing so, it was often led upon the path of political and economic corruption. As a result, it rapidly lost prestige. New conceptions of the church were being advocated in explanation of the weaknesses of the papal church and for the purpose of its reform.

The formation of national states, proceeding according to the new principles of national sovereignty, caused the establishment of

national and territorial churches whose ties with Rome and its ecclesiastical universalism tended to become more and more tenuous. The Conciliar movement which, for a time, successfully replaced the traditional monarchism of the popes by the authority of episcopal councils, also produced strong anti-hierarchical tendencies. William of Occam (d. 1349), and Marsilio of Padua (*Defensor pacis*, 1324) proposed ecclesiological theories in which the church was defined as the "assembly of all believers" (*congregatio omnium fidelium*). After many centuries of oblivion, the church was once more interpreted as a people and the laymen were again understood as fully legitimate members of the church. Occam wrote: "Laymen and lay women are ecclesiastical persons just as the clerics are, for they belong to the church just as the clerics do."²⁸ The Scripture and not the hierarchical Canon Law was the norm of these affirmations. The principle of tradition (*quod semper, ubique et ab omnibus creditum est*, "what all believe everywhere and always") was here radically attacked.

Adding to all these tendencies an almost prophetic passion as well as a glowing patriotism, John Wiclif (d. 1384) advocated not only the establishment of non-papal national churches but also a new universalism grounded in an energetic Biblicism and in a predestinarian theology. "Christ, the only head of the church," and "the Bible, the law of state and church"—these were the principles of the church reform which he urged upon England. By defining the church as the "congregation of the elect" (*congregatio omnium predestinatorum*) he desired to have it understood as an object of faith. Thus he hoped to disentangle it from papal-hierarchical rule by which he saw the true nature of the church perverted. By demanding, however, that the church suffer itself to be outwardly organized and administered by political rulers in order that it thus might obtain freedom from Roman administrative encumbrances and the possibility freely to preach the gospel of the Bible and to dispense its disciplines, he involuntarily showed to what a degree he was still remote from the realization of the full social meaning of the church idea. The reform he advocated was primarily critical of the papacy and designed to correct the papal mismanagement of the English church. As a reformer Wiclif remained ineffective. Even in England his ideas were ruthlessly suppressed. John Huss adopted them and through him they inspired the Czech Reform movement of the fifteenth century. But this undertaking also was not a real reform of the papal medieval church but a correction of some of its "abuses." It did not produce a new understanding of the nature of the church.

IV

It was the eruption of profound religious experience controlled by the Bible which caused Luther and the reformers to introduce an

entirely new phase into Christian thought about the church. As a result, new Christian communions came into being.

Even after recognizing the inevitability of a conflict with Rome, Luther at first clung to the Roman Catholic conception of the church. When he was forced to expound his ideas in answer to Roman Catholic critics, he continued to think in scholastic terms. Although, in the course of time, he came to feel the influence of Conciliarism and Occamism, he approached the anti-papal radicalism of these schools only gradually. He too interpreted the church as a *corpus mysticum* which Christ creates and guides by his spirit. The chief difference between Luther and scholasticism was that, while scholasticism interpreted the *corpus Christi* in connection with the sacraments and the hierarchial order, Luther emphasized the Word. Within this new frame of reference, he declared the nature of the church spiritual and apprehendable only by faith. In so far as Christ renders his spirit efficacious through the preaching of the word and the administration of the sacraments, this invisible church undergoes a process of materialisation (W. Koehler) in becoming a visible cult congregation. Luther's growing understanding of the implications of his faith-word theology caused him to discover the historical, relative, (and by no means divine) authority of the papacy and of the councils. And finally he rejected the whole system of canonical law together with medieval sacramentalism. Thereby he destroyed the principle that certain forms and orders of organization and cult are essential to the nature of the church. Tradition assumed a relative character.

The resulting reduction and simplification of fundamental Christian concepts (a most significant beginning of a process which extends to this day!) cleared the way for a fresh appreciation of the social character of the church. Luther incessantly stressed the *communio sanctorum*. For him it meant the community or assembly (*Gemeinde*) of holy, pious, believing men on earth, maintained and ruled by the holy spirit and daily increased by the Word and the sacraments (W. A. 7, 219). He also stressed the real personal interrelation of its members marked by an interchange of commonly possessed religious goods. The idea of the universal priesthood of believers was the revolutionary expression of this new church concept. "Its reference is not to individual privilege but to social duty and social experience." (J. T. McNeill). *So wir denn mit Christo ein Kuchen sind so wirkt dasselbige souiel, dass wir auch untereinander ein ding werden . . . Keiner ist für sich selbst, sondern jeglicher wirft und breitet sich unter die andern durch die Liebe.* (W. A. 12, 448).

The church is then both visible and invisible at the same time. It transcends all historical occasions and associations, because it rests in the free activity of God, the salvation of Christ and the work of

the holy spirit (the Word) but it is simultaneously immanent in all historical occasions and associations in so far as the cult of the *Wortgottesdienst* and the community and mutual responsibility of Christian love inform them.

Luther's religion was not a repristination of first century Christianity. The authority of the Word stands as definitely in contrast to the spiritual eschatology of the early Christian church as does the authority of the sacrament. The Roman Catholics, in proclaiming the transmission of the holy spirit through the sacraments, may call themselves Paulinists as rightfully as Luther and the Lutherans. For it was Paul who, by coordinating his sacramental mysticism with the spiritual eschatology of the Kingdom of God and the coming of the Lord, inaugurated the era of Christian institutionalism, *thereby* securing the permanence of the Christian movement (we should never forget this!). But, of course, we must also acknowledge that Luther by worshipping the Christian "holy" in the *Word* rather than in sacramental *substance* released from it a religious dynamic which sometimes produced an eschatological awareness spiritually akin to that of early times.

It was still more important that he rediscovered in the "Word" also the spirit of prophecy, although Lutheranism soon concealed this finding in the static norm of "pure doctrine." But until this day Protestantism has lived of these rediscoveries of Luther. From him it received the possibility, in the name of the supremely free Word of God, of breaking through a *status quo* sanctified by tradition and to make a new beginning. Here lies also the reason why faith and belief in forgiveness are *the* Protestant doctrines.

The main difference between the Reformation and early Christianity, however, lies in their respective attitude toward the world. Luther was often consumed by the awareness that the end of the world was near, but as a man of the 16th century he knew it was there to stay and that it had to be fully accepted by the Christians. Because of its openness toward the "world," Protestantism changed and widened the Christian horizons. The order of nature and the social order were recognized in their independence.

From this point of view, one must understand the formation of Lutheran state churches and the formation of the complicated, often contradictory doctrines of the church which accompanied their making. I can not here discuss Luther's conception of the office of the ministry; his earlier hope in the possibility of forming independent congregations and his later recognition of the necessity of establishing "*Volkskirchen*"; his distinction between spiritual and secular power; his introduction of the magistrate into the work of reformation on the basis of the teaching on the "emergency episcopate" of the princes;

his conception of the coordination of the three hierarchies, the *ordo oeconomicus* (family), the *ordo politicus* (state), and the *ordo ecclesiasticus* (church); and finally his distinction between the person and the office of the Christian, so significant for his social ethics. All these ideas, which were grounded partly in medieval traditions, partly in practical requirements of a confused period of transition, and partly in the personal prejudices of the reformer, led ultimately to the formation of the Lutheran territorial churches. These were mainly concerned to guard their spiritual (i.e. chiefly doctrinal) independence, while they left the organization of the church and the ordering of social life in the hands of so-called Christian political "patriarchs." The social ethos of the church expressed itself henceforth in the penetration of secular orders by the strictly personal virtue of love. Christian persons were expected spiritually to qualify the social order which was believed to proceed according to its own inherent norms. The Lutheran church thus became a preaching, teaching church. Melancthon, its real founder, once called it a *coetus scholasticus*. And in the Augsburg confession he defined it as a *congregatio sanctorum in qua evangelium recte docetur et recte administrantur sacramenta*. (Art. VII).

Calvin's idea of the visible church was essentially the same: *Hinc nascitur nobis et emergit conspicua oculis nostris ecclesia facies. Ubi enim cunque Dei verbum sincere praedicari atque audiri, ubi sacramenta ex Christi instituto administrari vidamus, illic aliquam esse Dei ecclesiam nullo modo ambigendum est*. (Inst. IV, 1, 8, 9). But under his hands the church assumed a new character. Under the influence of his doctrine of the sovereignty of God, he conceived the true church as invisible, consisting of the elect. Moreover, under the impact of his Biblicism and particularly by the resuscitation of Old Testament piety, he transformed the *communio sanctorum* into a group of disciplined Christians, organized according to the instruction of the word of God in the offices of preachers, teachers, elders and deacons. The emphasis upon church discipline became the source of a second Protestant church idea and the means of a new definition of the church as a Christian social order. Calvin called it, following the Biblical and medieval example, the *regnum Christi*. Its citizens are those who in their entire lives obey the law of Christ, the law of the Bible.

Calvin's theories imply a much clearer distinction between the church and the state than Luther had been able to make. In his establishment of the church of Geneva, he succeeded to a remarkable degree in separating the realm of the church from that of the state. But this insistence upon the distinction did not prevent him from advocating a Christian commonwealth subordinated to the sovereign will of God. In this regard (as in others) he followed the example of his

teacher and friend, Martin Bucer of Strassburg, who in his last work, *De regno Christi*, written in Cambridge for Edward VI (1551), proclaimed the Christianization of all political, social, economic and cultural life in terms of a *respublica Christiana* which for him was identical with the Kingdom of God.

These new ideas, fashioned after the requirements of 16th century city republics, prepared the way for later church doctrines. They were to inspire the *separation* of church and state as well as the development of an aggressive Christian social gospel.

V

The history of the Protestant church idea is so complicated that it is almost impossible to describe it in a generalizing survey. The following observations may prove helpful toward the understanding of the specific historical data:

1. Protestantism is itself a complex phenomenon. The spiritual Bible-oriented revolt of the 16th century produced almost immediately a great variety of church types and church ideas. Their character was derived not only from the religious impulses emanating from Luther's prophetic personality, but also from the new cultural spirit of the Renaissance and especially the movement of Humanism. Moreover, they were grounded in radical ideas and tendencies of the later medieval church and dependent upon political and economic factors (nationalism and early capitalism) and social movements (the restlessness of the common man). The main ecclesiastical groups were the following: (a) Lutheranism; (b) Calvinism; (c) Anglicanism; (d) the Anabaptists; (e) the so-called spiritual reformers; (f) the humanists. While the representatives of these groups worked out their characteristic church ideas and organizations in accordance with their individual comprehensions of the Christian religion, they were related to one another either negatively (in opposition) or positively (in interconnection). Calvinism appeared as Puritanism in its conflict with the Anglican church and Puritanism felt the influence of the Anabaptists and the spiritual reformers. There were constant crossreferences between the men of these latter groups. The spiritual reformers had a close kinship with the humanists. The church ideas of the various groups remained individual, but none remained untouched by the impact of the power of the others. Hence it is impossible to discover a single *typical* Protestant church idea.

2. The feature which all Protestant church ideas have in common is derived from the rejection of Roman hierarchical sacramentalism. It may indeed be said that the Protestant church concepts remain unintelligible without reference to their Roman Catholic background. In the light of this fact, it is not surprising to find that the Roman

Catholic tradition has exercised a continuous influence upon all modern church ideas.

3. In the course of time, all Christendom (and particularly Protestantism) was exposed to the forces of modern western civilization. The secularization of the state and of the economic order compelled all church groups to re-think their creeds and their ideals of communion. Especially the fact that the state became more and more the dominating power in modern society radically transformed all church ideas. The practice of toleration and the dissemination of the idea of religious tolerance which accompanied this rise of the sovereign political state had a revolutionary effect upon the theory and practice of the ecclesia. They signified the emancipation of the "world" from the Christian groups. The efficacy of the spiritual realities transmitted through the *preached* Word, the sacraments and other more intangible vehicles upon human living began to wane. The peculiar social cohesiveness of the church groups in so far as it was grounded in faith and theology and religious symbols was dissolved. The character of the ecclesia was more and more determined by reference to what were no longer vitally effective historical traditions or to social, economic or political factors. The churches became "feudalistic," "bourgeois" or "proletarian." They lost the relationship with the "sacred" center. The meaning of the word "church" based upon the meaning of the word "ecclesia" was dimmed. "Denominations" came into being.

The details of the history of the idea of the church in Protestantism can here not be analyzed. It is apparent, however, that one of the major lacks that must be fulfilled by contemporary Protestants is to develop a doctrine of the church which convincingly states the Christian conviction that Christians are a "peculiar people." It is gratifying to note that the activities of the World Council of Churches are primarily directed toward the accomplishment of this end.

- 1 Vis. II, 4, 1.
- 2 *Adv. haer.* III, 24: *In ecclesia posuit Deus universam operationem spiritus; cuius non sunt participes omnes qui non concurrant ad ecclesiam . . . ubi enim ecclesia, ibi et spiritus Dei, et ubi spiritus Dei, illic ecclesia et omnis gratia.*
- 3 *Ep.* 73, 21: *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus.*
- 4 1. Tim. 3, 15.
- 5 Tit. 3, 10; Eph. 4, 4 ff; John 10, 16; 1. Clem. 46, 6; 58, 2.
- 6 Eph. 5, 26; Barn. 14, 6.
- 7 Ignatius, Smyrn. 8, 2.
- 8 Hebr. 2, 12; 12, 23; Herm. Vis. 1, 16; 3, 4.
- 9 1. Clem. 44.
- 10 *C. Celsus* 8, 68, 69, 72. Cf. the treatment of Origen in Karl L. Schmidt *Die Polis in Kirche und Welt*. Zurich: Zollikon, 1940 (pp. 67-84). This study is very illuminating with reference to the early Christian preoccupation with the "heavenly city."
- 11 *Contr. ep. Manichaei* 5: *ego vero evangelico non crederem, nisi me catholicae (ecclesiae) commoveret auctoritas.* Cf. Adolf Harnack's beautiful interpretation of Augustine's relation to the church in his *Dogmengeschichte* (4th ed.) vol. III, page 79 f.
- 12 *de fide et symb.* 9, 21.
- 13 *ep.* 9, 21.
- 14 *Ibid.* 100, 1.
- 15 *De civ. Dei.* 19, 5.
- 16 *Ibid.* 10, 6.
- 17 *De civ. Dei.* 12, 9.
- 18 This involvement of the church in the feudal order identified it closely with the common life of medieval civilization, especially on the political and economic levels. At the height of the Clunia Reform, Pope Gregory VII attempted to secure the freedom of the church from some of the most glaring evils of secularization that had resulted from these entanglements by prohibiting lay-investiture, simony and priestly marriage.
- 19 It was only in the later Middle Ages and particularly in the post-Tridentine age that the theologians of the church concerned themselves exclusively with ecclesiology. Their doctrines were then marked by a defensive justification of Roman Catholic institutions and practices over against the criticisms of Gallicanism and Protestantism. The independence of the church from the state, the hierarchical nature of the church and the primacy of the papacy were then especially emphasized. Only in modern times, a full theological discussion of the nature of the church has become customary. It was inaugurated by Möhler, Pilgram and Franzelin. Cf. the remarks by Père Congar in *Isreland, Die Kirche Christi*, p. 55.
- 20 *Summ.* III, q. 8, a. 1, 3.
- 21 *Ibid.* suppl., 23, 9, 1.
- 22 *Ibid.* q. 26, a. 1.
- 23 *Summ. c. gentil.* IV, d. 18, q. 40, a. 6.
- 24 *Summ. theol.* II/II q. 1, a. 1. This title was, as Heiler (*Wesen des Katholizismus*, p. 118) observes, according to the New Testament the prerogative of Christ the Lord!
- 25 *Ibid.* q. 89, a. 9.
- 26 *Ibid.* II/II, q. 1, a. 10.
- 27 *Opusc. c. cor. Graecorum ad. Urbanum* IV, II, 38.
- 28 *Ita sunt personae ecclesiasticae laici et mulieris sicut clerici quia ita sunt de ecclesia sicut clerici.* Quoted by Reinhold Seeberg, *Dogmengeschichte*, vol. III (4th ed.) Leipzig: Deichert, 1930) p. 588.

THE POLARITY OF THE GOSPELS IN THE EXEGESIS OF ORIGEN

SAMUEL LAEUCHLI, *Arlesheim, Switzerland*

In spite of all the hermeneutic research, the allegorizing of the Alexandrians, and above all the exegetical work of Origen, remains a strange phenomenon of the early church. Historians have often smiled indulgently, if they have not scoffed, at those childhood steps of biblical interpretation within ancient Christian theology, from Thomasius more than a century ago up to our present.¹ The possibility of a complete understanding is hindered by the lack of many of Origen's texts in the original language. Many of his commentaries are lost. And yet there are certain indications from which we can learn that Origen did have his sound reasons for his exegetical undertaking.² For this, one has to examine the tenth chapter of his Commentary on John.

In his lengthy fifteen chapter exegesis of the account of the cleansing of the temple,³ Origen begins by stating the fact that John presents the story in which Jesus chased the ox and dove dealers from the temple as the second "work" done by Christ, whereas the synoptics report a similar event toward the end of his life.⁴ This pericope is closely connected, in the synoptic tradition, with the entrance into Jerusalem (the colt, the Hosanna). In the fourth Gospel, however, this story appears much later, at another arrival of Jesus in the holy city.⁵ What the synoptics report as a continuous event, at one and the same arrival, is divided by John into two episodes separated by many happenings in different locations.⁶

The synoptic-johannine question! There can be no doubt that Origen clearly sees it and tries to formulate it. As he says himself, he wants to show "the discrepancy of the text (*tēn kata to rēton diaphōnian*).⁷ Two sources tell contradictory stories, and there is no way to combine the presentation of the synoptics with that of John. To harmonize this discrepancy is strictly impossible for one who does not recognize anything behind the mere history.⁷ Attempts had been made to harmonize the four gospels.⁸ In definitive contrast to Tatian and Theophilus of Antioch, here for the first time a theologian of the church realizes the full impossibility of any historical harmonization.⁹

Origen discovered not only the conflict within the evangelical tradition but also the unity of the synoptics *against* John, purposely quoting each at full length in order to bring out the tremendous

contradiction which exists between them and the fourth Gospel. The three report the same event much later; what transpires at two arrivals in John, happens at one and the same arrival according to the three. One can imagine that the ingenuousness with which he deals with these not harmless matters would have been impossible within the formed and stabilized Christian church of only a few centuries later. To be sure, he senses the dangerous ground he is walking on: anyone who believes that he has not dealt honestly with this problem may reasonably write a refutation.¹⁰ This is a cautious hint, indeed, with a view to the tremendous bearings of the problem but still, to judge from what follows, more a rhetorical phrase than a sign of uncertainty.

Origen had two ways out of this blind alley: he could either choose one of the two versions as the true one by negating the historicity of the other—this would have been a question of probability and personal decision—or he had to deny the historicity of both versions. Origen chose the second. With theological freedom as well as sharp historical criticism he deprives the story of the cleansing of the temple of its historical authenticity: how could the son of a carpenter have dared to drive the merchant people with their doves and oxen from the temple? Would it not have been *hubris* for Jesus to scatter the money of the changers and to overturn their tables? If anyone had been struck by the scourge of cords, would he not have fought back, especially when a whole mob of people must have thought they had been treated unjustly? And finally, does it not seem presumptuous and daring to assert that the Son of God took a whip and made a scourge in order to chase people out of the temple?¹¹

Origen undertakes literary criticism with an audacity which sometimes reminds us of rather modern methods of biblical exegesis. There is only one historical fact at the basis of the story according to him: that in Lent merchants used to bring animals for the offering into the outer-court of the temple. This event has been used by the evangelists.¹² The rest is *not* history. What pushed Origen to make such a critical judgment, so extreme and daring for his time?

From the very beginnings of the second century, the fact of a plurality of gospels had been perceived in the church as a weighty problem.¹³ Even though Irenaeus tried to create the pretence of a natural order for the existence of four separate Gospels, by pointing to the cosmic-holy quaternary number, the church always had to defend itself against the two attempts to solve the problem that were ever again repeated: either to accept only one of the four gospels (as Marcion did), or to take up a harmonization (Tatian was not the only one to try this, and his *Diatessaron* was so popular that

it finally had to be forbidden by the bishops).¹⁴ By proving the full discrepancy, Origen makes every harmonization impossible. If he had chosen, however, either of the two,—the synoptics or John—as the true source, he would have abandoned the ecclesiastical tradition of the equivalence of the Gospels, by admitting falsifications of one evangelist. Further, which is even more important, it would have been almost impossible for him to make a choice. To decide against the three synoptics would have been hard, and to eliminate the Alexandrians' most inspiring gospel was out of the question.

While criticizing the cleansing of the temple, Origen realizes that this story is connected directly, according to the synoptics, with the pericope of the entrance into Jerusalem. These two stories, their relationship and their divergency, create the whole historic problem which Origen faces here. Consequently, he turns his literary criticism against that second story. Again, some of the arguments are exceedingly weak (how could it be otherwise, his being the first serious exegetical attempt within the post-apostolic church?). Was it necessary to send two disciples into the village of Bethphage in order to find an ass and her colt? Was it worth recording that he entered the city sitting on an ass and her colt?¹⁵ An ass would not be worthy of the divinity of the Son. And besides, a journey of fifteen stadia is not long enough to justify the use of these animals, and why was it necessary to have two?¹⁶ The main argument, however, sounds quite different: the Zechariah quotation should consist of Zech. 9:9-10. The evangelist quoted only Zech. 9:9 ("Rejoice greatly . . . thy king cometh unto thee . . . riding upon an ass") and left out 9:10 ("I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim and the battle bow shall be cut off . . ."). Now Zech. 9:10, says Origen, would not have been applicable to the act of Jesus' coming into the town—he did not destroy any chariots nor cut off any battle bow. Because this was not true historically (different, of course, is the anagogical aspect of the whole matter which Origen discusses thoroughly afterwards), it would be wrong to use the Zechariah text in respect to Jesus, for the Jews could embarrass the Christians seriously by asking us how Jesus destroyed chariots of Ephraim!¹⁷ For the first time, as far as we can see, a theologian of the church¹⁸ sets it forth as fact that a passage of the Old Testament has been used in the New Testament in a not completely correct way and opens therewith the modern discussion of such consequence about Gen. 3:15, Dt. 18:15, and Is. 7:14,¹⁹ although it took the church one and a half millennia to realize the gravity of this problem. Origen, of course, had no inkling of what kind of spirits he was letting loose in the church. He only claims, as he says, that the Zechariah text does not permit us to speak about a "somatic fulfillment." The starting point of this spe-

cific criticism was not the realization of a wrong textual application itself but the necessity of depriving the Matthew passage of its historic ground.

The main discussion about the plurality of the gospels is found in the beginning of the tenth chapter of the Commentary on John. There Origen presents with uncompromising clarity the full discrepancy between John and the Synoptics. He develops it in his exegesis of John 2:12 ("He went down to Capernaum"), comparing it with the synoptic parallels which report that after the temptation Jesus went up to Galilee, stayed in Nazareth²⁰ and came then to Capernaum to live there.²¹ Now it is simply impossible to bring these two versions together on any historic basis; the forty days of the temptation have no place at all in John! When did Jesus come to Capernaum? If he went down after the six days of his baptism (the sixth was the wedding of Cana) then he never was tempted, nor lived in Nazareth, nor was John the Baptist thrown into jail. And in Capernaum, according to John, he did not stay long, but departed for Jerusalem, where he drove the animals out of the temple.²²

This is the whole problem of the Gospel of John and the Synoptics: one excludes the other. And Origen did not close his eyes, as many modern exegetes do, dealing cleverly with the interpretation alone. He asks the decisive question: how can these both be true at the same time: that Jesus went to Galilee after the imprisoning of John the Baptist (Mark and Matthew) and (John), that he went to Capernaum right away and then to Jerusalem, while John the Baptist was still preaching in Aenon near Salim?²³ How can two expositions which contradict each other both be true and retain their validity? What is historically contradictory cannot be historically true. And Origen knows well enough that this is not the only case where a discrepancy can be found; in many other places there is a "disharmony of history."²⁴ It is astonishing how well this early church exegete sees the problem. "How can both be true?" Here there is no synthesis any more, no possibility of eliminating one or the other. If we want to maintain the equal value of the gospels, we have yet to admit the historical disharmony. Origen makes every harmonisation impossible. Perhaps he thinks of the many of his time who still believe in Tatian's attempt in the *Diatessaron*. "Let them tell us," he says, "where the forty days of the temptation are to be found in John!"

What does Origen achieve with all this? With a slight irony Thomasius assumed that Origen started from the prejudiced opinion that in allegory he had "the key to Scripture," and that in order to substantiate this idea he sought for contradictions in the texts where

nobody would think of them.²⁵ It is exactly the other way around! Not that we should deny the sometimes naive character of the constructions and arguments of which Origen makes use. But in the given passages he does not search for something that is not there; he discovers one of the greatest difficulties in the realm of the New Testament, a problem Thomasius and his whole age had not even seen. Origen does not create contradictions; he finds them. And even more, he sees them because he is aware of the consequences for a systematic theology. He did not start criticism because of some prejudice (why would this have been necessary?) but because he was looking for the theological truth of the gospel. And then he discovered the full paradox.

Exactly here we find the inner *justification* for Origen's allegorical method in the interpretation of the Scripture. Allegory had had already a long history, from the interpretations of Homer by the Greeks, to the Rabbinic exegesis, to Philo and the church fathers.²⁶ And Origen of course, participates in this tradition.²⁷ However, we cannot simply explain everything from historical dependence.²⁸ There is in Origen a *necessity* for his allegorical method, a necessity which comes from the New Testament itself! And by this necessity he can justify his whole undertaking of interpreting the Scripture anagogically. "If we cannot solve the divergency, because of the plurality (of the gospels),²⁹ we have to give up the belief in the gospels, assuming then that they are not true nor written in the divine Spirit . . ."³⁰ Those who do not believe that anagoge is the only way to solve the very apparent divergency, should tell us where to find in John the forty days of temptation.³¹ There is the basis for his anagogical interpretation. For four gospels have to be kept as documents of the divine truth. They only remain such documents if they harmonize together; otherwise the divine truth breaks asunder. How can they harmonize, however, on historical grounds, if the contradictions lie visibly open? The interpreter *must* find the realm above history, above the literal text, in which the unity exists. The texts themselves urge him to do it, and driven by this necessity, Origen finds the answer: the truth lies in the noetic: *tēn peri toutōn alētheian epikeisthai en tois noētois*.³² In the realm to which anagoge leads him, unity is possible.

This urgency does not exclude the fact that Origen stands within the history of allegory. However, there is, beyond any slavish dependence, this inner basis from which we can well understand his whole undertaking, i.e., the problem which has remained to this very day a weighty question, perhaps not so much for the historian as for the systematic theologian.³³ Because Thomasius, Denis and Eugène de Faye did not see this New Testamental basis, they could never understand the whole exegetical undertaking of Origen.³⁴ If this

polarity, developed in John Comm. X, is but a fictional assumption, the criticism and the attempt to overcome the discrepancy would turn out to be a farce, indeed. Nowadays, we realize that this divergency is not simply a fiction and that it was not Origen, unfortunately, who has made up the contradictions.³⁵

To show the unity of Holy Scriptures was one of the great goals of Origen's interpretation, to live in that eternal symphony of such manifold books, as the famous fragment of Matt. Comm. II so beautifully proclaims it.³⁶ How he was forced from the historical paradox to achieve a solution, the apologetic situation shows. We know the pagan philosophical opinion about the Christian doctrine from Celsus and Porphyrius.³⁷ This "superstitious sect" was ridiculed everywhere, and the heathen thinkers were always looking out for new targets. These unsympathetic critical eyes could not possibly miss for long the paradox within the central tradition of the Christian church. An attack from this direction, therefore, could soon become extremely dangerous for the defenders of the faith. Origen prevented this possible surprise by exposing the divergencies in their full rigor. But this was not enough. They still could have triumphed over the trivial contradictions within the reports about the life of God's Son. So Origen had to prove that there was a unity, by demonstrating the great harmony in the noetic realm.³⁸

In this struggle of the Christian theologian against the manifold trends of pagan thinking, the vast majority of the uneducated believers created the greatest obstacle. There was a group of Christians, in the line of the first post-apostolic texts, which acknowledged neither criticism nor allegorism, proclaiming a moralistic and eschatological faith. These biblicists simply wanted to accept the text as such, refusing the pneumatic level in which Origen tried to reconcile the paradox. If they had succeeded, the way would have been open again for the pagan attack. For these reasons, Origen found himself in an apologetic situation, trying to show the impossibility of historical harmonization. For the first attempt at harmonization came precisely from these groups, from the author of the book against the Greeks!³⁹

There is a third basis for Origen's apologetic stand in his rejection of Gnosticism. In spite of all his dependence upon, and relationship to, this second century movement,⁴⁰ there was a decisive break from it in his being rooted in the tradition of the New Testament, in his existence as a member of the *ekklesia*.⁴¹ Every religious group in that age had to refer to a period of revelation, using holy scriptures which were regarded as absolute. Like everybody else, the Gnostics had done this too.

Clearly aware of the noticeable difference between their theo-

ries and the New Testament documents, they set to work to create their own gospels, new lives of Jesus. Now if the contradictions in the tradition about the Lord must remain utterly unsolved, the path was opened wide for new, "better" reports, and this meant for other gnostic speculations. For this reason again, therefore, Origen could by no means ignore the discrepancies, but must explain to his readers how great a unity bound the four gospels together. His method led him to it, and without necessity for creating new gospels or for searching for other documents, provided him with the means of killing the gnostic claims of the insufficiency of Scripture.

These three worlds, pagan philosophy, Fundamentalism, and Gnosticism, in turn forced Origen to the necessity of an interpretation beyond the historical text. Even more, they gave him the justification for it. He had to be able to defend the documents which were the foundations of the young church. There is something in his theology from each of the three, no doubt: he possesses the Greek desire for and conception of truth and cannot get rid of a good number of Hellenistic elements;⁴² he owes important ideas to the Gnostics;⁴³ and, in spots, we notice a strange fundamentalism in his exegesis.⁴⁴ But, in his central position, he is neither a Greek nor a Gnostic nor a Fundamentalist. By his anagogical interpretation he defends his ecclesiastical theology against each of the three.

There is an important question one might ask in respect to the beginning of the tenth chapter of the Commentary on John. In *Peri Archon* Origen postulates an explanation for the fact that in some passages unhistorical events are to be found: the evangelists purposely wove unhistorical stories into the historic facts.⁴⁵ Let us assume, he says, four persons who, in the spirit, all see God. Each of these will report this epiphany in his own way. The time may be the same, but the exact words and location may differ in each account (one sees God standing in a certain place, while another sees Him somewhere else sitting and saying quite different words.)⁴⁶ It is always the same vision, and the same God. The disharmony disappears as soon as we recognize that the historians wanted to teach by a sign (*charaktēr*) what they have seen in the spirit. In a mystical intention (*mustikos skopos*) they weave into the *aisthēton* (i.e., into their presentation of what one perceives with the senses) that which they perceived purely noetically.⁴⁷ One finds here two arguments which originally do not belong together. God is beyond the human categories of space and time. He can reveal himself to two separate persons at the same time, whereby this revelation is not at all devaluated by any discrepancy which might arise. The earthly contradiction becomes a divine harmony because God in his noetic nature is not bound to human presuppositions.⁴⁸ This approach to the biblical discrepancies, however,

especially as applied to the New Testament, could turn out to be exceedingly dangerous. For Jesus had no purely noetic nature but existed in flesh and blood. If this argument is carried through, all the doors are opened for a docetic christology.⁴⁹ So the other theory arises which could be applied with less danger to the tradition about Jesus: the biblical authors wove the unhistorical into the historical texts. The docetic misunderstanding is thereby precluded.

In the account of the cleansing of the temple, we see perfectly well how Origen utilized this theory: the whole pericope was made up and never actually happened. In his exegesis of John 2, 12 he demonstrates very obviously how John and the synoptics disagree with regard to the main trends in the life of Jesus. He does *not*, however, apply his principle here. At least, he does not carry it through. Not once does he return to the question of the forty days' temptation from which he started. Had he applied this principle here, he would have had to say that all these divergent passages had been purposely woven into the historical account, only the pneumatic element within being true. Origen did not dare to take this step, in spite of his deep understanding of the critical questions in the New Testament.⁵⁰ The reason for this lies again in his apologetic interest. The philosophers were perhaps willing to accept Jesus as a mythological figure (like Adonis, Isis, Mithras), and the Gnostics spoke about spirit till matter ceased to exist. Origen did not want to surrender, consequently, such a considerable part of the historical Jesus. This is the reason why he did not decide whether the forty days of the temptation or the going up to Jerusalem was woven into the history by the evangelists.

The Origenistic exegesis contains a good many riddles for the modern interpreter. It belongs to a long tradition of the same kind of explanation. It is involved in Origen's terrific struggle for a Christian theology and stands at the beginning of a long history of ecclesiastical exegesis. One of the astonishing factors in it is his realization of the polarity of the gospels, not alone of the polarity itself (Tatian and Clement of Alexandria saw this also) but of the problem of this polarity. What happens to the believer if he takes both the history and the theology seriously, trying to combine the historical moment of the Christian revelation with its content, without falling either into a docetic mysticism or into a moralistic humanism? It speaks for the greatness of Origen that he saw and honestly expressed this tremendous tension. In it one finds the justification for his allegorical method. Because he could give up neither historicity nor the claim of an absolute truth (both being essential elements of Christianity), he had to find a realm above history in which the historical text could be interpreted. This is the *sine qua non* of his exegesis.

- 1 Gottfried Thomasius: *Origenes, ein Beytrag zur Dogmengeschichte des dritten Jahrhunderts*, Nürnberg 1837 pp. 311 sqq. ("willkürlich . . . masslos") Luther: *WA Tischer. I* (Weimar 1912) p.106, Jacques F. Denis: *De la philosophie d'Origène*, Paris 1884 ("Idées abstruses, Jeu d'imagination, Formes de la liberté de la pensée") pp. 33sq. Bigg: *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, London 1886 ("The Alexandrine method as applied by Origen is undoubtedly unsound" . . . "Such Paltering with the text is not honest"!) pp. 146sq. Lately: Cumont: *Recherches sur le symbolisme funéraire des Romains*, Paris 1942. As for the history of the interpretation of Origen's exegesis see: De Lubac: *Homélies sur la Genèse*, Introduction, Paris 1943.
- 2 Ernst Rudolf Redepenning: *Origenes, eine Darstellung seines Lebens und seiner Lehre* (2 vol.) Bonn 1841-46 already recognized that only Origen himself would be able to show us the reason for his interpretation, and that within it, the Scripture itself will give us the decisive basis. Pp. 322 sqq. Therefore, there is no condemnation ex cathedra in Redepenning, in contrast to so many others.
- 3 *John Comm. X*, 20-34 (Between the references in GCS).
- 4 *Ibid.* X, 20 [119].
- 5 *Ibid.* X, 21 [123-128].
- 6 *Ibid.* X, 22 [129].
- 7 *Ibid.* X, 23 [130].
- 8 Cf. Oscar Cullman: *Die Pluralität der Evangelien als theologisches Problem im Altertum* (Theol. Zeitschrift d. Univ. Basel 1945, Heft I).
- 9 Clement with his distinction of bodily and spiritual gospels and Marcion with his choice of one gospel perhaps had an inkling too.
- 10 *John Comm. X*, 23 [130].
- 11 *Ibid.* [145-147].
- 12 *Ibid.* X, 25 [144].
- 13 Cf. Cullman: *op. cit.*
- 14 Jerome: *Ep. 121*, 6, 15.
- 15 *John Comm. X*, 26 [159-160a].
- 16 *Ibid.* [165, 164].
- 17 *Ibid.* [163].
- 18 One might assume a direct or an indirect influence from Marcion or the Gnostics. However, this is hard to prove.
- 19 One thinks of Wilhelm Vischer: *Das Christuszeugnis des Alten Testaments* 1934-42 and the rejection of his opinions by the plurality of Old Testament scholars.
- 20 Origen has for Nazareth *Nazara*: (*John Comm. X*, 2 [9], X, 11 [50]).
- 21 *Ibid.* X, 1-2: Matth. 4, 1 c. par.
- 22 *Ibid.* X, 3 [10b-11].
- 23 *Ibid.* X, 3 [13].
- 24 *Ibid.* X, 3 [14].
- 25 Thomasius: *op. cit.* p. 33. Cf. also Redepenning *op. cit.* vol I. p. 316.
- 26 Cf. for this: Daniélou: *Origène*, Paris 1948 pp. 175-190.
- 27 Redepenning did see this: *op. cit.* vol. I p. 297.
- 28 Bigg realized that one cannot understand Origen simply from his historical presuppositions. He therefore also separates him distinctly from Clement of Alexandria: *op. cit.* p. 134. Also Henri de Lubac: "Entre Philon et Origène, il y a tout le mystère chrétien!" *Homélies sur l'Exode* pp. 15 sqq.
- 29 The addition by Preuschen: *dia tous pollous* is evident.
- 30 *John Comm. X*, 3 [10a].
- 31 *Ibid.* X, 3 [106a].
- 32 Even if the beginning of X, 2 is corrupted (cf. the footnote in Preuschen's edition), its meaning is perfectly clear.
- 33 Beside Henri de Lubac, Preuschen (in his introduction to the critical edition of the Commentary on John) has strongly defended Origen against the reproach of a technical taking over of the Alexandrian allegorism. "... nicht nur gedankenlose Nachahmerei . . ." he says: p. LXXXIII.
- 34 Thomasius did not know what to make out of *John Comm X*, 1sq. *op. cit.* p. 316. The best Denis could say was: "Origène ne déprime la lettre que pour mieux faire sentir la nécessité de chercher sous le sens historique un sens spirituel" pp. 36-40 *op. cit.*, and Eugène de Faye called Origen's exegetical work an "unbelievable illusion" *op. cit.* vol. I p. 95. Redepenning has been considerably more careful: *op. cit.* vol. I p. 292. In his work about the exegesis of Origen, J. Prat: *Origène*, 1908, misses completely the critical aspects and does not speak about the historical problems at all, just mentioning *John Comm. X*, 5 in a footnote (pp. 130-133).
- 35 Without knowing exactly these reasons, Redepenning was right in postulating that the Scripture itself had to furnish the explanation for the exegetical attempts of Origen: *op. cit.* vol. I p. 322.
- 36 *Philocalia VI*, 2 (ed. J. Robinson, Cambridge 1893).
- 37 Cf. Eusebius: *Hist. Eccl. VI*, pp. 19 sqq.
- 38 For this apologetic side of allegorism cf. Bigg: *op. cit.* pp. 139 sqq. If there is a negative and a positive side of allegorism, as Bigg suggests (the first being apologetic, and the second for the discoveries of mysteries), these two aspects are almost identical in the question of the polarity of the gospels.
- 39 One finds therefore Origen opposed to both at the same time, to the *Diatessaron* and the *Contra Hellenes*.
- 40 *Peri Archon* is called a "System patristischer Gnosis" by Hans Jonas in *Theol. Zeitschr. d. Univ. Basel*, 1947, Heft 2.
- 41 Cf. the discussion about Heraclion's com-

mentary in Origen's Commentary on John.

- 42 Hal Koch: *Pronoia und Paideusis, Studien über Origenes und sein Verhältnis zum Platonismus* Leipzig 1932.

- 43 Cf. Hans Jonas: *loc. cit.*

- 44 In John Comm. VI, 30-39 for instance, Origen compares the words by John the Baptist about his not being worthy to unloose the latchets of the Messiah (John 1, 26-27) with its parallel texts: Matth. 3, 11, Mark 1, 7sq. and Luke 3, 15sq. Analyzing every little difference (the mentioning of the penance in Matthew, the different order of words, the discrepancies), he comes to the conclusion that those reported sentences by the Baptist could not possibly go back to one and the same event. Otherwise, Origen says, we should have to assume that the evangelists erred and reported wrong details. (VI, 34) For it is not the same "to unloose the latchets" and "to bear the shoes," the first being told by Matthew, the second by Mark, Luke and John. John the Baptist has spoken both, at different oc-

casions, in order to express each time something specific. And Origen tries to find the explanation and the connection of the two: the two versions represent two stages within the life of a Christian. First, he kneels down in order to unloose the latchets, then, however, he achieves the unloosing of his shoes, separating himself from the shoes, ie. from the earthly. The *kupsas* of the first version does not exist anymore in the second. This is no doubt a highly literal treatment of Scripture. Nevertheless, it shows us how utterly seriously Origen takes the discrepancies of the New Testament.

- 45 John Comm. X, 5 [18] P. A. IV 3, 4.

- 46 John Comm. X, 4.

- 47 John Comm. X, 5.

- 48 He does not work *para* but *huper tēn phusin* K. K. V 23.

- 49 Right afterwards (John Comm. X, 6) he struggles with vehemence against the Gnostic docetism.

- 50 Had he done so, he would have had to give up perhaps half of the gospel material.

CELIO CALCAGNINI (1479-1541)

QUIRINUS BREEN, *University of Oregon*

Celio Calcagnini's¹ active career falls in a period marked by many men of note and by a number of significant events. He touched some of these directly or indirectly. He was involved in an imperial and in a papal war, in an imperial election, in the controversy stirred up by Luther, in the divorce question precipitated by Henry VIII. He fanned into flame the conflict over the imitation of Cicero. He took an interest in Egyptian hieroglyphics. Independently of Copernicus, Calcagnini made a curious and not altogether ridiculous contribution toward creating an attitude of mind favorable to the new conception of the solar system for which Copernicus was to become famous. He was personally acquainted with the painter Raphael, with Jovius, with Manardi the physician,² with Ziegler, the poet Ariosto, the humanist Erasmus. In his home-town of Ferrara he enjoyed a place of honor as university professor, as apostolic prothonotary, as an excellent dinner host. He was considered to be one of the most learned men of Italy. Yet his importance was always that of a bridesmaid rather than of a bride. It has its uses, however, to look at a wedding from a bridesmaid's angle. To see an era reflected in the career of a minor actor may prove rewarding.

Calcagnini's life must be narrated with a brevity all out of proportion to its interest. He was born September 17, 1479, the natural son of prothonotary Calcagnini and Lucrezia Constantini of the noble Rovigo family. He was brought up in his father's house. An early teacher of his in Greek was Baptista Guarino³ (son of the famous Veronese). From the invasion of Charles VIII to 1506 he was in military life, mainly in the imperial service, but also in the papal. After a brief period as secretary to the Duke of Ferrara he was (1509) called to the chair of Greek and Latin letters at the University of Ferrara, a position which he held for the rest of his life. In 1510 he entered the service of the Church, as canon of the cathedral of Ferrara. He achieved the title of apostolic prothonotary. He seems to have had some talent for diplomacy. After serving as the Cardinal's agent in Venice and in Rome he was a member of his superior's staff on a year and a half's mission to Hungary.⁴ In Hungary he was restlessly occupied in scientific studies. There he met Jakob Ziegler,⁵ whose friendship was valuable for his studies in science. He represented the Cardinal in the election of the Emperor Charles V.⁶ Upon his return to Ferrara he found some of his prebendary interests⁷

were in such danger of being lost to him that he had to go to Rome in his own behalf. There he met Jovius, Calvi, Aleander, Raphael.^{7a}

Back in Ferrara (1520) the rest of his life was largely devoted to professorial and literary labors. He worked on Pliny's *Natural History*,⁸ translated Plautus' *Miles Gloriosus* for the court,⁹ wrote much occasional verse. He began a history of Ferrara, but his most memorable production of historical nature was a numismatic collection¹⁰ for the state. He was an important sponsor of the first literary academy of Ferrara—that of the *Elevati*.¹¹ Calcagnini bequeathed a library of 1249 volumes to the convent of the Dominicans of Ferrara for public use.¹² His works were given by him to Duke Ercole II, who at his own expense had them printed by Froben at Basel (1544).¹³

As to a discussion of his works, the sequence here followed is topical and climactic: (1) writings pertaining to Luther's thought; (2) correspondence relative to Henry VIII's divorce question; (3) works on Cicero and Ciceronian imitation; (4) scientific writings, particularly the one in which he defends the thesis that the earth moves and the sun stands still.

It was the *De libero arbitrio* of Erasmus which prompted a writing by Calcagnini against Luther.¹⁴ His friend Bonaventura Pistophilus¹⁵ had sent Celio a copy of Erasmus' book. Pleased with it Celio put down his own thoughts on the freedom of man. It is in the form of a letter to Pistophilus. He attacks Luther's doctrine of predestination. He praises Erasmus' views. He calls Luther "the fierce boar which devastated the vineyard of the Lord and upset the vessels of the tabernacle." Protestant thought he calls "that Lutheran ulcer." For the rest, his work is of philosophical vintage. He lists the opinions of the philosophers on one side and on the other. The rest of the letter does not make mention of Luther directly.

Erasmus saw this writing in manuscript; he wrote Calcagnini on May 13, 1525, saying he liked it and would have had it printed save for some points he did not approve of and would not correct without Calcagnini's permission. In July 1525 Calcagnini answered that the writing had been intended only for Pistophilus, not for publication, and not even for Erasmus' perusal. He adds, however, that he is content to have Erasmus correct it and print it if he wishes. He says Luther should not be given too much attention because his pride will merely rise thereby. Calcagnini's interest in the cause of orthodoxy continued till at least 1538 when (July 23) he sent his friend Pellegrino Morati—a well-known Lutheran—a not less important letter in refutation of the doctrine of justification by faith alone.¹⁶

Calcagnini was also involved in the controversy of Pope Clement VII with King Henry VIII. He admired Henry for his defense of the faith against Luther.¹⁷ Richard Pace had also given Celio a high

opinion of the king.¹⁸ At the same time Richard Croke (the famous Greek scholar) was in Italy to collect from savants and theologians opinions favorable to the divorce. Croke was said to have at his disposal money to induce favorable opinion.¹⁹ It is possible that Pace urged Croke to approach Calcagnini. Celio dealt with the matter academically. While he brought forward all the arguments favorable to the King he did not give definite form to his own conclusions.²⁰ We are led to believe that he himself did not take pay for his opinions. His colleagues of the theological faculty did, however, submit signed favorable opinions. When their pay was not forthcoming Celio pressed the English envoy to pay the money due them, but he refused to be the channel through which the money was to be distributed.²¹

Then politics entered upon the scene. The scholars were generally favorable to Henry. Duke Ercole II would have enjoyed having them make public their opinions to spite the Pope whom he disliked. But there was the Emperor Charles V to reckon with. One had to remember that he was the nephew of Queen Catherine whom Henry wanted to divorce. This very year (1530) Charles was to determine the fate of Modena and Reggio; and the Duke could not risk alienating him. So he had to keep informers away from the professors so that their opinions on the divorce should not be made public. In a letter to Croke Calcagnini tells of a notary who had been asked to copy in legal form the responses of some Ferrara theologians; but on account of fear he disappeared. He had even turned down Celio's offer of a rich reward for doing this favor to the potent King Henry. The notary complained of being in a bad situation, for on the one hand he could not afford to reject the King's money but on the other hand he was not such a fool as to risk his life by the hope of lucre. In the same letter Celio writes of a brother of an agent of Henry coming to Italy, a certain Casali. Immediately there came a satellite of the court, "eyes and ears of the prince," advising him neither by impudence or by lust for gain to do anything which could displease the duke.²² To top everything Croke left Italy without warning.^{22a} In his letter to King Henry Celio explains his own position and assures him of his devotion. It goes without saying that Celio could hardly have foreseen Henry's actions of 1533 and subsequent years.

In 1532 G. B. Giraldi Cinzio asked for his opinion on the imitation of classical models: Cicero, Virgil, Horace. Celio replied July 15 with a booklet *De imitatione*.²³ The real question of course was what he thought about the vogue of imitating only Cicero's writings. On a previous occasion Celio had scorned servile imitation of Cicero. In the *De imitatione* he said one ought to think with one's own mind, that it is unworthy to abdicate one's own personality. He says Cicero himself did not reject other writers. He says Caesar had written his

Commentaries on the Gallic War with the same greatness of mind with which he had fought his wars. In writing of medicine he says it is better to use Celsus, and that for science there is no better model than Pliny. In all this Celio's position agrees with that of Erasmus' *Ciceronianus*.

Extreme imitators of Cicero received this booklet with horror. They were still more shocked when he published *Disquisitiones aliquot in libros officiorum Ciceronis* (1536).²⁴ Celio's friend and fellow-citizen Alberto Bendedei had censured some statements in Cicero's *De officiis*. This gave him the occasion to examine the *De officiis* further and to add some criticisms of his own. (*Opera* 253 for letter to Bendedei.)²⁵ The points raised were on the whole not grave. Celio made no attack on Cicero. He proposed, for example, that Cicero had done better to have entitled his book in the singular (*De officio*) instead of the plural (*De officiis*). In some points Celio raised questions of a philosophical kind.

In 1543, two years after Calcagnini's death, Marcantonius Majoragius published a bitter attack upon this work.²⁶ Paulus Jovius remarked in his notice of Calcagnini that had Calcagnini been still living Majoragius' arguments would have strangled him.²⁷ It is curious that later Majoragius himself became something of a critic of Cicero, which led to an attack upon him by Marius Nizolius.²⁸ The latter had already become known for his 2-volume dictionary of Latin elegance which was based exclusively on the works of Cicero.²⁹ Nizolius was not a run-of-the-mill Cicero-imitator. He really combined his devotion to style with an interest in philosophy. In 1553 he published *De veris principiis philosophandi* in which he proposed to substitute grammar and rhetoric for dialectics and metaphysics in philosophy. This book did not get much notice till Leibnitz gave it attention by republishing it (1670) and furnishing it with a solid introduction.³⁰ Today it is considered to be one of the 16th-century philosophical works to be reckoned with.

Any narrative is of interest which casts light on the status of early 16th-century opinion on the relation of the earth to the heavenly bodies. Our Celio Calcagnini has the distinction of having written, some time between 1518 and 1524 a small treatise on the subject. He called it *Quod caelum stet, terra moveatur*³¹ (That the Heavens Stand Still and that the Earth is in Motion): It does basically little more than to argue that the earth rotates, to account for night and day. There is no suggestion that the sun is the center around which the earth and the planets revolve. Thus in idea it is only in part Copernican, though the part is an important one.

Where did he get the idea? It seems that Copernicus himself must be eliminated as the source. Though Copernicus attended the

University of Ferrara, Calcagnini was not in town at the time. Though Calcagnini was in Eastern Europe there is no likelihood that he met Copernicus there. Lazzari believes that he got the notion from reading Nicholas of Cusa and from hearing from old-timers what was remembered of his visit in Ferrara in connection with the Council of Florence (1438).³² Cusanus is at least lauded and his view on the earth's rotation mentioned in Calcagnini's treatise. Hipler makes something of Cusanus' influence, but also of the excitement among savants in Eastern Europe over Copernicus so that Calcagnini would certainly have been made aware of him. Hipler goes farther when he concludes that the idea of the earth's rotation, to account for day and night, was a kind of universal possession (Greek, Hindu, Hebrew, Moslem, Christian). He argues that it was near the surface of debate whenever Aristotelianism clashed with Platonism, that the Platonic suggestion had never had a Ptolemy as Aristotelianism had had. Hipler's view looks very attractive. He also suggests that Calcagnini's method of argument is very likely a reflection of the manner in which those argued who held to the view of the earth's rotation. Though we should like corroborative documents for this suggestion it seems a plausible one.

In any case, Calcagnini appears to have been the first Italian to affirm with formal arguments that the earth moves. He was conscious of doing an extraordinary thing. Dedicating his treatise to his friend Pistophilus he writes in a light vein:

"If you consider my little book too small in comparison with your great merits you will deceive yourself, dear Pistophilus, for this little work which you may think small and poor is nevertheless absolutely worthy of your attention. The ancients rightly admired Ctesibus and Archimedes who with little machines could raise small weights. My little treatise merits much more consideration, because it stops the swiftest course of the sun and planets and the marvelous motion of the eight spheres. It gives such an impulse to the earth that it runs with the greatest speed, dragging in its dizzy rotating motion living things, peoples, mountains and oceans."

He begins his treatise by arguing that one cannot trust the senses for sure evidence of the truth of things. Thus he argues for skepticism about the sense of sight. Sight tells us that the heavens are moving and that the earth stands still. But sight deceives us here, as it does with the straight oar that looks bent in water. When one is on a boat moving away from shore and when one looks only at the things on shore it is the shore that seems to move. "It is the vastness of the earth which hinders perception of its movement; perception of the velocity of its motion is reduced to nothing."

"In those matters, then, in which the senses cannot fully do their

duty, being hindered by some obstacle or limited by distance, nothing is more useful than to appeal to reason and to sift the arguments put forth in a doubtful case." He appeals to the authority of Plato (Gorgias) for putting greater confidence in reason than in the senses.

A second line of argument is that the things eternal, immortal and farthest from all change are those which are beyond the moon and nearest to heaven, while the things which are near are mortal, frail, always liable to continuous alteration. Thus Plato says (Timaeus) that such things always are in a state of becoming and never of being. Celio returns to this argument in a number of connections. He intimates that to say the heavens are in motion is degrading because the heavens are near God who is changeless. On the other hand motion is natural for the earth because everything earthly is in a process of change. He has a fairly long passage showing that things on earth are known to follow the sun. There are flowers that turn around to keep facing the sun. In fact there are laws of nature which engender in all parts of the earth an incredible desire to enjoy the celestial light of the sun: lifting its bosom to the sun the earth gets warmth for growing things and the succession of the seasons. What is more reasonable than to suppose that the heavens as source of earth's life are sufficient to themselves, in need of no motion to sustain themselves?

A third kind of argument derives from mechanics. Celio describes what he considers the nature of motion. He says it is weight that causes motion. The earth is situated in the center of the universe, in the lowest and most sluggish part. Its nature requires that no change can take place in its own mass. Nature gave this mass an initial impulse to move. The only way this mass as such can move is by rotating. The center stands still. Once it began to move the weight constrains it to keep moving. The most respected writers say that every movement comes from weight: lightness is considered a privation. The huckster knows this by daily experience with the steelyard whose use very nearly explains it. In a circle draw two isoceles triangles with the bases opposite so that the vertices of both coincide with the center of the circle. There set the pointer of the steelyard. The scalepans hang on either side toward the base of the lower triangle; neither scalepan can go further than this base which controls and fixes equilibrium. Put a weight on one of the scalepans; it will at once begin to move toward the bottom, while the other one will rise. A circular line is described. The upward and downward movements of the two scalepans go on equally until the one by its weight touches the middle of the base of the lower and the other by its lightness touches the middle of the base of the upper triangle. Thus it is certain that the movements of both scalepans result from weight.

One reads of the famous wooden dove of Archita, which was constructed with certain mechanisms and small weights in such a way that once having begun to move it continued to move without stopping.

Now heaven cannot be in motion because of its lightness; its quintessence is the absence of weight. Weight is, however, of the essence of earth; therefore it must move, and its motion must be a rotating one.

There is also an argument drawn from the greater simplicity of his idea. Thus Celio has considered how very much more difficult it is to conceive the velocity of the heavens rotating around the earth than it is to conceive of the velocity of the earth turning upon its axis.

Another line of argument is taken from the notion that man is a microcosm, a little universe. Now I ask you: Is motion or walking perhaps a function of man's highest part—the head—or of the lowest—the feet? No one is so ignorant as to deny that the head is put on top, as it were a tower which remaining firm provides security to the other parts of the body: the feet are formed to give the body movement. For the rest, the Holy Scriptures speak of the earth as the feet of Omnipotent God. Celio plays upon this idea of the microcosm with further illustrations taken from mythology and even from Egyptian hieroglyphics.

Being a humanist, Calcagnini need not amaze us by appealing to classical authors for support. A passage from Virgil is dragged in by the hairs. Celio is trying to meet the objections of those who say his idea can boast of no great names associated with it. So he brings in Archimedes of Syracuse. He says Archimedes as a man of high standing would never have said: give me but where to stand and I will (with a fulcrum) move the earth, had he not believed the earth movable. He cites Nicetas, Archimedes' fellow-citizen, as one who actually had held the heavens to stand still and the earth to rotate. Celio believed Plato held this, though obscurely. He finds his idea hinted at in Minnermus, and even in Homer and Hesiod. He finds it suggested in the proverbs of men, and even in some meanings of the word earth.

The treatise concludes by appealing to the authority of Nicholas of Cusa, a man of clear mind and great learning.

Celio's service was that of being among the first to propose a precise formulation of the earth's rotation. He says, e.g., it moves from right to left, meaning from West to East. He gives reasons for his belief in the existence of antipodes. In his era, when the current view was bolstered by the testimony of the senses his arguments for distrusting the senses and relying more on reason had a certain importance. This Platonic element played a like role in other Renaissance protagonists of science. His argument from mechanics deserves more

than passing notice. His concept of the heavens being lighter than the earth does not impress us, but it was perhaps generally respectable in his time. At least the argument for rotation based on the steelyard perhaps has possibilities. It were interesting to know to what extent Celio impressed an audience with his arguments from classical literature, from the idea of the correspondence between macro- and microcosm, from mythology and even from the proverbs of man. More impressive may have been his observation of flowers which follow the sun.

We cannot clearly make out what he owed to Nicholas of Cusa. That churchman's speculations on the earth's movement can hardly be taken seriously so far as mention of them in his works are concerned. Actually, however, Nicholas may have left a memory of conversations on the subject. He had been in Ferrara for the famous council of 1438 (which moved to Florence). Conversations favoring so novel a theory may have been remembered in Ferrara. Calcagnini being a churchman and close to the highest ecclesiastics in Florence may have learned whatever there was remembered. It is reasonable that what was remembered was more memorable than the scattered references in the Cardinal's works. But precisely what it was we do not know.³³

It is clear that Calcagnini discusses the question like a scholastic. The scholastic method was not altogether worthless for science. By means of it the rotundity of the earth had long been defended. Calcagnini's appeal to skepticism and to mechanics is not repugnant to scholastic method. This method is marked simply by disputation. Much light can come to a subject through disputation. The method may be weak on observation. It is strong, however, in its confidence in reason. It is most interesting to see how scholastic method was used by Calcagnini to create a mentality favorable to that theory of the solar system which later was to be so violently opposed by scholastics.

It is also clear that Calcagnini is arguing somewhat like a Platonist. He has Plato's distrust of the senses. Like Plato he dissociates matter from the state of perfection. Some historians of science have thought that Plato's influence has generally been harmful to science. In some ways this judgment is unjust. And in the case of Calcagnini the verdict can be in favor of Platonism. Calcagnini's Platonism has another interesting connection. I have mentioned above (p. 6) that his criticism of Cicero imitators and his questions about Cicero's *De officiis* led to a violent attack upon him by Majoragius and particularly by Nizolius; also that Nizolius' attack was partly philosophical. Eventually Nizolius took the position that all philosophy should be reformed by having grammar and rhetoric take the place of dialectics and metaphysics. He made, besides this, a clear statement to the effect that he trusted only the testimony of the senses. What he fought

was precisely Platonism in philosophy. I should like to prove that Nizolius' attack was to an extent an attack upon Calcagnini's Platonism. So far as my knowledge goes I have only some ground for mere hypothesis.

Calcagnini was a humanist. Generally speaking the humanists were professors of classical languages and literatures. It is a commonplace that these professors on the whole had little of deep interest in or importance for science. But just as a humanist might argue like a scholastic³⁴ so he might concern himself with science. Celio had a very real interest in science. At least he was intimate with Ziegler and with Cardinal Hippolytus, both experts in mathematics. He wrote a commentary on Aristotle's book on meteors. He worked at editing Pliny's *Natural History*. And according to his lights he defended the idea of the earth's rotation. We cannot say precisely what influence his thinking on astronomy had. It is safe to suppose that it offered what help it could to prepare the way toward whatever favorable reception Copernicus' views enjoyed in the 16th century; which at best was little; even the University of Geneva did not allow a course on Copernican astronomy till 1673.

Finally, Calcagnini was a churchman. He was a canon of the Cathedral of Ferrara and Apostolic Prothonotary. For this and for his writing against Luther and his part in the divorce story of Henry VIII he belongs to church history. Perhaps even his views on the earth's motion belong here, if indeed he owes them in part to Nicholas of Cusa and to what the clergy of Ferrara remembered about him. His criticism of Cicero (and of Ciceronians) belongs rather to his work as professor of literature. But the questions he raised about Cicero's *De officiis* occasioned the writings of Nizolius which turned out to have philosophical importance. And few will affirm that even minor currents in philosophy have no bearing upon theology.

1 A basic source for Calcagnini is "*Caelii Calcagnini Ferrariensis, Protonotarii Apostolici, Opera aliquot*, Basileae (Froben MDXLIIII, hereafter referred to as *Opera*, Jo. B. Pigna published a collection of Calcagnini's verses in a book of his own: *Carmina (Pignae) libri quattuor. His adiunximus Caelii Calcagnini Carmina Libri III* . . . Venezia, Valgrisi, 1553. His verses are not included in the *Opera*. From the letters printed in the *Opera* a good deal of the life can be reconstructed. They offer many clues to the kind of man he was,—almost invariably friendly, generous, and seeming always either ill with a stomach disorder or happy to be on the mend. The last part of Celio's essay, "*Quod Studia sunt moderanda*" is autobiographical. It begins with the sentence: "I am a man

of moderate gifts and of almost no literary importance . . ." (*Opera*, 324-5).

A panegyric biography is by Tommaso Guido Calcagnini: *Della vita e degli scritti di Monsignor Celio Calcagnini Protonotario Apostolico*, Roma, 1818. G. Tiraboschi: *Storia della letteratura Italiana*, Firenze, 1809, T. VII names Calcagnini in the same breath with Manuzio and Alciati as erudites (p. III), gives a narrative of the greatness of Ferrara in learning and the arts of Calcagnini's period (pp. 40-48), gives a brief life and works of him (pp. 858-861), and is as usual invaluable for cross-reference.

The most thorough (though not exhaustive) life and works is that by Alfonso Iazzari: "*Un Enciclopedico*

del Secolo XVI: Celio Calcagnini," *Atti e Memorie della Deputazione Ferrarese di Storia Patria*, vol. XXX, Ferrara, 1936, pp. 83-164. I am greatly indebted to Lazzari. The same volume of *Atti e Memorie* . . . has Virgilio Mattioli's translation of (with introduction to) Calcagnini's treatise "Quod caelum stet, terra moveatur" (pp. 165-192).

As to the spelling of proper names I follow what seems usage: Celio Calcagnini instead of Caelius Calcagninus, but Jovius instead of Gioivo.

- 2 Giovanni Manardi had an excellent name as a physician. Like some other physicians of the time, Ant. M. Brasavolus (see below note 13) and Paulus Jovius (see below note 7), he was also a man of letters. See Tiraboschi, *op. cit.*, VII, 645-647. Celio also enjoyed the services of Vincentius Caprilis, ". . . a man of letters among your doctor colleagues . . . and a good doctor." (*Opera*, 60) Celio apparently was one of his intimate friends. He could write him of conversations about Ermolao Barbaro, about cucumber seeds for concocting elaterium (a purgative) (*Opera*, 51-52). A recurring theme of discussion between them was Celio's weak stomach. It seems the two disagreed on the diagnosis. Manardi's son Timoteo now and again gets a letter from Celio, as a sort of mediator in the argument (*Opera*, 82). Manardi had taught medicine in Ferrara from 1482 till about 1495 when he went to Mirandola. There he stayed some years as Gianfrancesco Pico's teacher and physician, also helping him with the publication of Giovanni Pico's work against astrology.
- 3 The celebrated Guarino Veronese (1370-1460) came to Ferrara in 1429 (or sometime between 1429 and 1436). Though in his sixties his natural force had not abated. In his declining years his son Baptista began lecturing at Ferrara. G. Voigt: *Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums*, Berlin, 1893, I, 467, II, 323-5. Baptista was a teacher of Giovanni Pico. See Tiraboschi, *op. cit.*, VI, 373.
- 4 The incumbency of Cardinal Ippolito d'Este as bishop of Eger in Hungary was part of the legacy of Matthias Hunyady Corvinus, King from 1459-1490. Crusading efforts after 1453, stimulated in Hungary in part by the Vatican, helped introduce the Hungarian court to Italian humanists. In 1471 Matthias began filling Hungarian dioceses with foreigners. Ippolito d'Este was given the archdiocese of Gran at the age of seven (1486). Matthias was a generous Maecenas of learning and the arts. Among those whom he drew to his court was Janus Pannonius, pu-

pil of Guarino Veronese at Ferrara. The great Bibliotheca Corvina was founded by Matthias. G. Voigt, *op. cit.*, II, 318-327. A. Aldásy, "Hungary," *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, New York, 1910, vol. VII, 552.

Celio had found favor with Cardinal Ippolito as diplomatic agent. This post had been held by Ariosto. Celio's favored position was due in part to the cardinal's preference for exact science and art rather than poetry; partly because Celio agreed to become a cleric, while Ariosto refused. In 1517 a noisy rift took place between Ippolito and the poet, when the latter refused the cardinal's request to accompany him on a journey to Hungary. Among others, Celio readily consented to go. Times were critical in Hungary. The Turk was at the door and there was no unity in the face of danger. At the Diet in Bâcs Celio delivered a sermon, *De Concordia*, to no avail (See Lazzari, *op. cit.*, 101-106.) Eight years later came Mohács. His travels took him as far as Cracow in Poland.

In a number of his letters from Hungary he complains of being in a kind of exile, a note which it was not uncommon for an Italian to strike when away from Italy. "I am far from home, far from my studies . . . exiled as it were in the middle of Scythia." (*Opera* 79) "Thrust out beyond the Danube (Ister) and beyond the borders into Scythia, little better than an exile I do not cease recalling the delights and sweetness of friends. You (Gyraldus) live in the center, in the bright spot (luce) of the human race, think with me how you may bring a light (lumen) to me pushed into this darkness" (*Opera* 80). "How nice to have you here, dear Bagnus. How will you like it among the barbarians? How will you get along with this vile and sordid race with the elegance you acquired in Italy?" (*Opera* 83).

The Calcagnini family had been in possession of certain benefices in Faenza and elsewhere. While in Hungary, Celio's family rights were being invaded "by the brothers Capo" in Faenza. For the narrative see *Opera* 76-77. A certain Hector Sacratius owes him money for which Celio's church of Saneta Maria Blanca is security. The debtor is bold to the point of indecorum. (*Opera* 88-89.)

- 5 Jakob Ziegler was a Bavarian humanist and a scholar in the sciences, mathematics and astronomy. My general information on Ziegler derives from Lynn Thorndike: *History of Magic and Experimental Science*, New York, 1941, Vol. V, 359, 370, 387, 409. He was interested in Regiomontanus' study of comets, whose *Libellus de cometa* he

published in 1548. His most notable work was an erudite commentary on the second book of Pliny's *Natural History* in 1531. Thorndike gives the long title in full (p. 387). One of Calcagnini's consuming interests was also in Pliny's *Natural History*. There can be little doubt that this drew him and Ziegler into a close friendship. See below note (8). Thorndike's bibliography on Ziegler consists of: Karl Schottenloher: *Jakob Ziegler aus Landau an der Isar*, Münster, 1910, and G. Eneström: "Le commentaire de Jakob Ziegler sur la 'Saphea de Zarkali (Arzachel)'" *Bibl. Math.*, X (1896) 53 seq. Ziegler sent to Celio a meteoroscope, the subject of some interesting correspondence (*Opera* 54-55, 56, 84-85). Ziegler had apparently made some dubious remarks about priests, to which Celio replies: "What you write about the priesthood I do not approve" (*Opera*, 56).

6 Cardinal Ippolito favored the election of Charles V. Celio was sent to represent him in Frankfurt-on-the-Main. Later Celio affected to boast of his success, but it was really Ippolito's determination and energy which stood behind him. (Lazzari, *op. cit.*, pp. 110-111.)

7 See above Note (4).

7a Celio came to Rome in October, 1519. It seems his relations with Paulus Jovius never became pleasant. In his *Elogia virorum literis illustrium*, 1577, Jovius speaks (p. 209) of Celio's works as "this hodge-podge brought forth laboriously and with much study from an old store-house which seems to the sensitive reader to smell somewhat rank." Friendlier critics have characterized his style as rough and negligent. Perhaps in part Jovius' bitter words are due to Celio's having criticized Cicero; perhaps the reason is personal. In any case, the story goes that the two were in a company at dinner with Clement VII. Jovius, a disciple of Celio Rodigino, pointedly asked Celio if he considered himself more able and learned than Celio Rodigino. Thus he tried to make our Celio appear arrogant should he say yes, and humiliate him should he admit inferiority. But our Celio scintillatingly replied: "Monsignore, it is certainly beyond doubt that one does not say the silurus is a sturgeon." This alluded to a checkmate of Jovius in a polemic with Johannes Manardus. See Lazzari, *op. cit.*, p. 140, who got the story from Jo. B. Giralduus Cinzius' *Ecatommidi*, Deca VII, Novella 5a. See also Alessandro Luzio-Rodolfo Renier: "La cultura e le relazioni letterarie di Isabella d'Este Gonzaga," 2. Gruppo ferrarese, *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, vol. XXXV (1910), Torino, p. 241.

For Celio's comment on Jovius see the end of this note.

In the same letter to Ziegler (*Opera*, 100-101) Celio writes of meeting Hieronymus Aleander as a man "among everybody held most dear . . . whom a little before my arrival the Pope of his own accord had made librarian after the death of Zenobius Azaiolus. Aleander daily ransacked the treasures of the Palatine library for me." Marco Fabio Calvi (whom Celio calls Fabius Rhavennus) is thus described: "An old man of Stoic virtue, a man of such humanity and learning that you would not easily decide which prevails. He translated Hippocrates entire into Latin, and has made him speak without a solecism. He is a most saintly man and he holds to something rare but peculiar to himself, to wit, that he so despises money that he will not take gifts unless in extreme need. Pope Leo gives him a monthly allowance which he usually disburses to friends and kinsmen. He lives, like the Pythagoreans, on small herbs and lettuce and dwells in a hut that you might properly call the dolium of Diogenes. He lingers on with his studies, but more truly he is dying with them. One might even say literally that he is dying, seeing he is already eighty and has contracted a serious and dangerous illness." This leads Celio to tell about Raphael. He says that Calvi was brought to Rome by Raphael, "a very rich man and in the highest favor with the Pope. He is a most kind-hearted young man and of wonderful genius. He excels in great qualities, is easily prince of all painters whether you mean in theory or in practice. As an architect he has such drive that he finds out and completes things which the most expert despair of undertaking. He not only explains Vitruvius in detail but with the most certain good sense defends or criticises him—yet so charmingly that there is no ill-will. [Was this an example for the future Cicero-critic?] Now indeed he is pursuing a wonderful task and to posterity unbelievable. I do not speak here of the Vatican basilica of whose architecture he is prefect, but rather of his plans for largely restoring this city to its ancient appearance, extent and symmetry. By picturing the excavations to be made in the highest hills and down to the deepest foundations and by bringing to mind the ancients' descriptions of methods he so excited the imagination of Pope Leo and of all the Quirites that as it were everybody felt they were entertaining some heaven-sent genius for restoring the eternal city to its pristine majesty. Raphael was so far from being arrogant that he went out of his way to

be available to and familiar with everybody. He avoided nobody's advice or conversation. No one more than he enjoys calling his own comments into doubt and dispute. He considers being taught and teaching the reward of life. This man cherishes Fabius (Calvi) as if he were his teacher and father; he defers in everything to him and abides by his advice."

At the very end of this letter to Ziegler, Celio writes of Jovius: "But lest the history of our times should not be recorded, Paulus Jovius—a physician, surprising as it may be—wrote so fine, learned, and elegant a history of our times, of which he just published ten books, that I should be ashamed to write so inelegantly about so eloquent a man." This last clause is somewhat ambiguous.

Luzio-Renier, *op. cit.*, p. 240, calls attention to Fr. Kuehlen: "Mareo Fabio Calvi und Celio Calcagnini in Bezug auf Raphael Sanzio," *Kunstblatt*, 1844, n. 46-47.

F. Gregorovius: *Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter*, Stuttgart und Berlin, 1922, VIII uses the above letter to Ziegler as his source for Calvi (p. 318). The same letter is used to describe in part the enthusiasm of the Romans for Raphael's plans for restoration of the city (p. 319-320). On p. 320 the distichs of Calcagnini celebrating Raphael's plans are printed. See also J. A. Symonds, *The Renaissance in Italy*, Modern Library, N. Y. 1935, Vol. I, 530.

- 8 Celio's concern with Pliny's *Natural History* should be of interest to those attempting to assess the relation of humanists to natural science. In a letter to his nephew Tommaso Calcagnini he defends himself against those who think he spreads himself rather thin in too many fields: eloquence, mores, nature, divinity, and so on. "But this (he says) is precisely what the Greeks meant by *paideia*, and we by *humanitas*" (*Opera*, 23). Celio was more than dilettante in science. This can truly be said of his concern with Pliny. "I burned with an always wonderful love of that author," he says in another letter to his nephew (*Opera*, 26). His writings prove this, for they are peppered with serious discussions of and casual references to points in Pliny. It is true that Celio's main object is to make an accurate commentary on Pliny. But this involves establishing a correct text. Now how does he establish a correct text? Here is an example. "Pliny notes (*Nat. Hist.* Bk. XIII, ch. iii) that Cicero (*De Orat.* III) says an unguent is pleasanter when savoring of earth than of saffron. . . . There was one who would emend earth to wax because, he said, earth has no

odor while natural wax does. . . . But what the smell is ought to be determined by *experiment* [my italics]. I think Pliny never said the earth is odorless. In Bk. XV Ch. xxvii he says there are three elements without taste, smell, and flavor: water, fire, air." For the rest Celio mixes discussion of Cicero, Pliny, and Theophrastus with observations of his own (*Opera*, 53). To Ziegler he writes inquiring about the attilus which Pliny says is peculiar to the Po River "in the passage discussing fishes proper to certain rapid streams. But I call upon you to attend not only to the testimony of Pliny but to *that of your own eyes* (my italics). (*Opera* 68). It is true that the advances of modern science have not come *via* commentaries on the ancients. On the other hand, one should bear in mind Celio's interest in Ziegler's meteoroscope. Celio is no mere parrot of the ancients. With respect to astronomy he will choose between two classical traditions as he understands them. See below pp. 6-14. As to Celio's expectations of Ziegler's researches on Pliny we have his letter: "Concerning my Pliny of which hopes once ran so high I have concluded that apart from you nothing will come of it. . . . I hear you now have as your only companion in this study the most excellent Balbus. I do not envy you this but I deplore my fate which has defrauded me of so exceptional a companion. Wherefore, dear Ziegler, I will be obliged to you; I pray, I implore, that if you have run across anything worthy of your genius and learning that you will not regard me as unworthy of having the mysteries whispered as to a fellow-celebrant. I look with incredible desire for your studies on the three chapters of the second book. . . . Whatever you will have said or thought I will forthwith regard as coming from an oracle" (*Opera* 77).

- 9 Lazzari, *op. cit.*, p. 119. Celio seems oftener to have translated comedies for the theater. At least once such labor was criticized. Feb. 15, 1532, Coglia wrote to the Marchesa of Mantua an unfavorable judgment on a comedy translated by Celio, which Coglia called a "carneval." It was the "commedia de l'omo d'arme furioso." See Luzio-Renier, *op. cit.*, p. 241, who cites D'Ancona, *Origini* 2, II, 431, n. 2.
- 10 Luzio-Renier, *op. cit.*, p. 240, says that in *Documenti inediti per servire alla storia dei musei d'Italia*, II, 100 seq., is published a catalogue drawn up by Calcagnini of the gold pieces in the Estensian collection. Lazzari, *op. cit.*, p. 123, dates it at about 1540.
- 11 The Academy of the Elevati was founded in 1540 by Alberto Lollio.

Celio's membership gave it great reputation. When he died the following year (1541) it dissolved. It was reorganized under the name of the Filareti. (Tiraboschi, *op. cit.*, VII, 162). Lazzari, *op. cit.*, 126, says the Elevati was the first literary academy of Ferrara.

- 12 The story of this bequest is one of the inspiring ones in the history of public libraries. Tiraboschi, *op. cit.*, VII devotes two pages to it (pp. 236-238).

- 13 The publication of the *Opera* was perhaps desired by Celio, though it is likely he had to be coaxed. Brasavolus intimates that Celio was present when his writings were being brought together from behind benches and chests. The library given to the Dominican convent is specifically stated to be for public use. If this is not the first it is an early case of such a provision in Ferrara.

Antonius Musa Brasavolus, in a letter dedicatory (*Opera*) to Ercole II says: "... there was scarcely an author whose works he had not devoured two or three times, and accordingly he looked down upon his own; neglected and unfinished they were to be found behind benches and chests (post seamna et serinia). If one asked him for something he had written himself he would get sick with the thought that all his own things were unworthy of being read. Nevertheless by the industry of Joannes Hieronymus Monferratus many things have been collected and put in one volume, and they would have perished otherwise. When the Reverend Celio saw all these things brought together into one body of writings he made a decision as to the disposition of the produce of his mind and fortune. Being a very wise man he willed his fortune to his kin, his library to public use (in publicam utilitatem), and he made you, most serene prince, the heir of his own writings. . . . He designated three men who were close to him as friends—Jacobus Boiardus, Johannes Hieronymus Monferratus, and myself—to do all in their power to execute his wishes." Brasavolus was a student of Celio, became a much-praised physician. See Tiraboschi, *op. cit.*, VII, 647-649. Joh. Monferratus was also a former student of Celio.

- 14 For Erasmus-Calcagnini correspondence see P. S. Allen: *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*, Oxford, 1906-47, Epp. 1576, 1587, 2869. In Vol. III, 26, Allen erroneously entitles Celio's little work *De libero arbitrio*. The title is: *De libero animi motu ex sententia veterum philosophorum* (*Opera* 395-399). It was written Jan. 3, 1525. See P. Lauchert: "Die italienischen literarischen Gegner

Luthers." *Erläuterungen und Ergänzungen zu Janssens Geschichte des deutschen Volkes, herausgegeben von Ludwig von Pastor*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1912, pp. 312-315.

- 15 Tiraboschi, *op. cit.*, VII, 40-41, says Bonaventurus Pistophilus of Pontremoli, a man celebrated for his devotion to the learned men and poets, was secretary and confidential minister of the Duke of Ferrara. He also tells of Pistophilus' amazing library and of his extensive numismatic collection (*Ibid.*, 254-255). Pistophilus seems to have enjoyed the confidence of Calcagnini. His "Quod caelum stet et terra moveatur" was composed in the form of a letter to this remarkable secretary (see below note 31). In Celio's letters there appears a dialogue between the two. In it Celio tells of his regrettable absence in the country because of the pest in Ferrara. Pistophilus replies that Celio [he calls him Celio] had better be glad not to be a secretary: "Others play, joke, have good times, but I must remain in the same spot. I'm completely buried in a mound of business. I'm bound with a chain; it makes no difference whether it is of gold or of brass—a chain it certainly is. I'm tied to this whole days, even nights during which I very often am awake reading and writing letters. Such letters as I get for rewriting; they come to me labored and illiterate. I tell others what to write; the sheets come back to me and I have to erase, interline, and change what is on them. This is often more work for me than if they had dictated them to me in the first place. Then the postmen from practically the whole world seem to converge on me with their solid packets of letters written (I think) by people brought up to use Egyptian hieroglyphics. . . ." (*Opera*, 59).

- 16 *Opera*, 195. This letter is translated in Thomas McCrie: *History of the Progress of the Reformation in Italy*, Edinburgh 1827, p. 183, from whom J. A. Symonds borrows. *Renaissance in Italy*, Modern Library, N. Y. 1935, Vol. II, 551-2. For Pellegrino and Curione see F. C. Church, *Italian Reformers 1534-64*, N. Y. 1932, p. 65.

- 17 Celio expressed this admiration in a letter to Henry VIII (*Opera* 155-156).

- 18 Writing to Henry, Celio says (*Opera* 155) "Richard Pace once spoke to me in much detail of your wisdom, clemency and gentleness of spirit . . . when he went through Italy at the time he was regium orator." This must have been a few years earlier, for Pace was in 1530 too ill to be on a busy mission. See *Dictionary of National Biography*, New York, London (1908), vol. XV, 22-24.

- 19 Celio wrote five letters to Richard

- Croke (*Opera* 150-155). Croke "solemnly asserted that he never bought opinions, but admitted that he was as liberal as his means allowed in rewarding those who expressed themselves as he desired. His extant accounts show him to have paid sums to all manner of persons." (*D.N.B.*, vol. V, 120-121)
- 20 *Opera*, 156 (Letter to Henry).
- 21 *Opera*, 154 (Letter to Croke).
- 22 *Opera*, 153 (Letter to Croke).
- 22a *Opera*, 156. In the letter to Henry Celio says that Croke's sudden and unexplained departure is the reason why he (Celio) did not put in final and presentable form his account of the opinions at Ferrara on the divorce.
- 23 *Opera*, 269-276. See also Lazzari, *op. cit.*, 141-142.
- 24 *Opera*, 251-269. Lazzari, *op. cit.*, 142, reports that it was printed by Robert Wisner in Basel, 1536.
- 25 *Opera*, 253 (Letter to Bendedei).
- 26 "In Decisionibus XXV quibus M. Tul. Ciceronem ab omnibus Celii Calcagnini criminationibus liberat," M. Ant. Maioragii *Orationes et Praefationes* . . . Coloniae Agrippinae, apud Ioannem Gymnicum, sub Monocerote, MDCXIV. In 1546 Jacobus Grifolus also answered Celio's criticism: M. Tullii Ciceronis *Defensiones contra Celii Calcagnini Disquisitiones in eius officia per Jacobum Grifolum Lucinianensem*, Aldus, Venetiis, MDXLVI.
- 27 Jovius, *op. cit.*, 209.
- 28 "Marii Nizolii Brixellensis defensiones aliquot locorum Ciceronis in libro De officiis, contra Disquisitiones Coelii Calcagnini Ferrariensis." This is printed in *Ciceronis De officiis Libri III . . . cum Petri Marsii, Fr. Maturantii, Omniboni, Martini Philetici, et Ascensii, in haec omnia praestantissimus commentariis. Marii Nizolii . . . Defensiones . . . contra Disquisitiones Calcagnini*. Venetiis, apud Joan. Gryphum, 1584 (ten columns, pp. 246-248).
- 29 *Marii Nizolii Brixellensis Observationum in M. T. Ciceronem Pars prima* [vol. I], *Pars secunda* [vol. II], ex Prato Albuini, MDXXXV.
- 30 "De stilo philosophico Nizolii," G. G. Leibnitii *Opera Philosophica*, ed. J. E. Erdmann (Berlin, 1840), 55-71.
- 31 *Opera* 388-395. An informing and suggestive study of this work is given by Lazzari, *op. cit.*, pp. 149-164. An interesting and very attractive discussion is that of Fr. Hipler: "Die Vorläufer des Nikolaus Copernicus, insbesondere Celio Calcagnini," *Mittheilungen des Copernicus-Vereins für Wissenschaft und Kunst zu Thorn*, IV Heft, Thorn 1882, pp. 49-80; pp. 59-68 discuss "Calcagnini und Copernicus"; pp. 69-78 reprint the text of Calcagnini's treatise. Hipler reports a German translation of the text by Prof. Dr. Schlüter of Münster, in the journal *Natur und Offenbarung*, Münster, 1879, pp. 575-602. An Italian version of the text is by Virgilio Mattioli (see above note (1)). I am indebted to Mattioli for his help. Celio sent the little treatise with a covering letter to Pistophilus (*Opera* 387), and the treatise itself is put in the form of epistolary discourse.
- 32 Lazzari, *op. cit.*, 154-155; Mattioli, *op. cit.*, 170.
- 33 Lynn Thorndike discusses "Nicholas of Cusa and the Triple Motion of the Earth" in *Science and Thought in the Fifteenth Century*, New York, 1929, Ch. VII, pp. 133-141. From this it would appear that Cusa was not an important figure in the history of astronomy. What Thorndike says does, however, confirm the idea that Calcagnini derived some of his notions *via* Cusanus. In any case, Calcagnini says he did.
- Thorndike disdains the claim of many that the Copernican revolution really began with Nicholas of Cusa. The name of Calcagnini was likewise linked with that of Copernicus. In 1616 Paul Minerva of Bari, moderator and regent of the University of Naples, says that while the theory of Copernicus is to be rejected, it is useful for discussion. He says that it is an opinion of many ancients, and that more recently Celio Calcagnini supported it, and that Copernicus later employed it to establish his hypothesis. (Lynn Thorndike, *History of Magic and Exper. Science*, New York, Vol. VI, p. 63.)
- 34 Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, a celebrated humanist, defended the method of scholastic reasoning. See my "Giovanni Pico della Mirandola on the Conflict of Philosophy and Rhetoric," in the *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. XIII, No. 3, (June, 1952), pp. 384-391 and 394-402.

NEGLECTED ASPECTS OF ROGER WILLIAMS' THOUGHT

MAURO CALAMANDREI

The object of this article is to suggest an interpretation of Roger Williams' thought different from that which is found in most of the literature on the founder of Providence, and to point out some neglected and important aspects of his system of ideas. To summarize it briefly, this interpretation holds that far from being a humanist Roger Williams believed in the radical depravity of man and the necessity of Grace; that far from being a rationalist Williams was a Biblicist; that far from being an optimist in history, Williams was a Millenarian; and rather than being a democratic Baptist Williams believed in the prophetic ministry free from any congregational limitations—in short, that rather than being a man of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment Roger Williams was a Puritan. The orthodox attitude to Roger Williams is misleading because it either distorts, or overlooks, or denies a primary religious concern in his thought and life, as a review of the historiography will readily show.

After a careful reading of most of what has been written about Williams, and of what Williams himself did and wrote, it does not seem presumptuous to say that his cast of mind is yet to be explored. Early colonial historians misrepresented his character and personality because his political views were offensive to the oligarchy. The first generation treated him "as a fanatical heresiarch in religion and a factious disturber of the State,"¹ and Rhode Island as a community of seditious factions and immoral anarchists.

Not until the end of the eighteenth century was a sympathetic and detailed interpretation of Williams' life, writings, and deeds presented by Isaac Backus in his *History of New England with particular reference to the denomination of Christians called Baptists*. His study is still useful and remains a rare example of sympathetic history undistorted by the empty sectarian generalizations of other Baptist writers.

During the nineteenth century there originated that dreadful tradition of Williams as a romantic hero. His name began to appear in American biographies, his career to stir the imagination. We still find, however, some understanding of the theological implications of his position, though progressively the one point stressed and overstressed was the idea of religious freedom. The pattern was set subsequently by a series of public lectures given in different places at different

times, which, as one can readily imagine, encouraged more and more an exaggeration of the romantic aspects. This was a road as smooth as ruinous; as quickly as historians turned into panegyrists, Roger Williams became the "prophet of tomorrow" and the "apostle of the liberty of conscience." After all, this was a period when anti-Puritan historiography flowered: it seemed simple logic to infer that an irrepressible enemy of the puritan oligarchy of New England was therefore the forerunner of liberal and modern views.

No more than twenty years ago, H. B. Parkes wrote in an historical journal that Williams can be appreciated only "if one looks at him from the 20th Century," while his antagonist John Cotton "was unintelligible except to those who approach him by way of the Middle Ages."² As if history knew only two types of civilization—that of the Middle Ages and that of the 20th Century. In his absolute lack of historical consciousness H. B. Parkes typifies the biographers and historians who have made of Roger Williams an advocate of rational philosophy, the herald of modern humanism and individualism, a proponent of liberty of conscience in the Jeffersonian way—or even in the 20th Century way.

In Parrington the lay interpretation attained its mature, fully articulated expression. To discover among the first settlers of America a man who appeared to envision the realization of every principle and value cherished by himself must have been a great pleasure, indeed, to one who could not stomach the Puritans. Understandably, his excitement inspired him to write lyrical and enthusiastic pages about this prophet and martyr of the First Amendment. The section on Roger Williams in *Main Currents in American Thought* has been, unfortunately, particularly influential through its effect upon the approach of J. E. Ernst, one of Parrington's students.³ These writers share the main presuppositions that "the cast of his [Williams'] thought was social rather than theological," that his mind was essentially modern, and that "his true place in American thought has been long obscured by the ecclesiastical historians"⁴ and by Puritanical prejudices against him. In spite of this bias, Ernst's first book is most useful. As a matter of fact, his investigation of Williams' writings is thorough and painstaking. He successfully determines Williams' principal contributions to political philosophy, though his analysis is invalidated by what he claims for Williams, to whom he attributes not only the fundamental ideas of modern democracy, but also almost every practical conception of the American political system and of modern democratic institutions. Three years after the appearance of his initial study, Ernst published *Roger Williams, New England Firebrand*. This study might have been a useful work, for Ernst's research on primary sources, properly presented, would have been

of unquestionable value. In its present form, it is one of the weakest and most misleading to appear in recent times. The turgid rhetorical style, the naïve enthusiasm, do not justify the neglect of footnotes and bibliographies. This apparatus would have enabled the student to profit from the author's knowledge of primary sources if only by directing him to the original documents. In the light of their content, the student might evaluate the historian's conclusions. Take as an example the following passage which contains Ernst's historical judgment on Roger Williams (it is copied almost literally from Parrington):

In his seekerism he anticipated the rationalists and romantics of the eighteenth century, and his enquiryism connects him in spirit with Bacon and the eighteenth century deism. In his transcendentalism he is the forerunner of Emerson and the Concord school, with his emphasis on the indwelling God in a world of material things. He anticipated Channing and the Unitarians in his doctrine of spiritual health and "cheerfulness," living hope and love and open mind.⁵

Incidentally this passage is part of a chapter that follows a lengthy, detailed summary of Williams' last book, *George Fox digg'd out of his Burrowes*. I shall not debate whether "the cast of Williams' thought was more social than theological," or vice versa; this passage raises a more profound issue. If the words rationalism, deism, transcendentalism, Puritanism, and so on, are historical terms, if they are definitions established in order to describe certain sets of values, facts, and trends in intellectual history, the writer who pretends to be an historian must cultivate the perception which makes him sensitive to their differentiating characteristics.⁶ Ernst's enthusiasm, aggressiveness and dogmatism preclude that historical accuracy which alone makes possible an understanding of the differences, for instance, between a "digger" and a Marxian communist, or the puritan Williams and the rationalist Thomas Jefferson.⁷

Apparently, however, erroneous historical views have a strong appeal among even more skilled specialists than J. E. Ernst. The most persistent *cliché* on Roger Williams is that of his rationalism and humanism. So expert a student of Puritanism as William Haller speaks of the doctrine of "free justification" for all, the "theory of natural rights," the "mystical brotherhood of all," and "spiritual equality" in relation to Williams' ideas.⁸

W. K. Jordan, despite his long acquaintance with sixteenth and seventeenth century English thought, makes such unqualified statements as these: "Roger Williams based his philosophy upon the nobler grounds of liberty of conscience rather than upon the more expedient grounds of religious tolerance," and "Roger Williams was the Arminius of New England Orthodoxy."⁹

However, we must not forget that recently, since a more thorough and comprehensive reinterpretation of Puritanism has been undertaken, some new light has fallen upon Roger Williams as well as his

contemporaries. Curiously, no recent study has been devoted to him completely. A. S. P. Woodhouse's scattered notes on and references to Williams in his standard introduction to the Clarke Papers in *Puritanism and Liberty* still provide the most enlightening and helpful introduction.¹⁰ However, Professor Woodhouse fails to grasp Williams' position wholly, because he limits his penetrating analysis to the *Bloudy Tenent* and to the other works on religious toleration written in the course of the controversy with John Cotton.

The same objection can be made to *The Puritans*, the standard anthology compiled by Miller and Johnson, which has contributed greatly to a fresh understanding of Puritanism. The major interest in the mainstream of American Puritanism caused the authors to overlook secondary or dissenting figures, and long familiarity with the Massachusetts Bay writers apparently encouraged them to maintain the traditional conception of Williams as the advocate of unlimited liberty, and a troublemaker.

An approach to Williams through the toleration controversy is dangerous, because it tends to overestimate the differences between Roger Williams and the other Puritans. Moreover, in focussing our attention mainly on the issue of freedom of conscience, we incline to regard Williams primarily as a political thinker and to overlook his theology and to dismiss his use of the Bible as a sort of "Puritan camouflage," or metaphorical style. But natural philosophy, human society and politics were not his first concern. None of these was the foundation of his doctrinal system and the object of his efforts. If proof is demanded, one should remember that Williams, in addition to carrying on a political controversy with the Massachusetts Bay Colony, also engaged in a theological and religious controversy with the Quakers which produced *George Fox digg'd out of his Burrowes*. This was his last work, but throughout his life Williams wrote about political topics and religious matters. If religious phraseology were mere camouflage would he have composed a devotional tract like his *Experiments of Spiritual Life and Health*?

Anyone who undertakes a systematic reading of his works finds that Williams was a Puritan with a primary concern for religion. If the reader desires to obtain a balanced, complete view of Williams' thought, he should ignore the customary approach and read his predominantly theological works. The last of these, *George Fox digg'd out of his Burrowes*, is the one which gives us the most realistic picture of Williams' mind. Second in importance is his discourse, *The Hireling Ministry none of Christ's*. The first tract is certainly tedious, repetitious, and unsystematic; without moderation or order it is ill composed. But the second is a small masterpiece of inspired and well ordered composition. Together they give us the true image of Wil-

liams' convictions. Surprisingly little attention has been paid to them.

When Roger Williams argued with the founders of the Massachusetts Bay Colony he took for granted their common platform. We moderns have difficulty in realizing that their fundamental beliefs are the implicit background of the *Bloudy Tenent*. But with the Quakers he was compelled to discuss the foundation of his "Christian Faith" and to state the common tenets of all Puritans, regardless of sectarian differences. At this time he believed that he was defending the cornerstone of Christianity threatened by the Quaker Antichrists.¹¹

In the rest of this article I shall concentrate my attention primarily on the theological works of Roger Williams, trying to illustrate aspects of his thought which are generally neglected.

Some of the topics to be treated will be:

1. Williams' "seekerism," "skepticism," "individualism," which is confined to problems of church and ministry and does not affect ultimate issues of religious authority and doctrines.
2. Williams' doctrines of the Church: his belief, in principle, in a visible church, his view of church and ministry in his day, and its relationship to a "prophetic" reading of history.
3. Williams' political theory: the rôle of civil magistrate in the commonwealth is not only to restrain evil and maintain order, but primarily to secure freedom to the Spirit and Word of God, thus accomplishing an end which is not purely secular.
4. A brief discussion of the connections and inter-relationships between Williams' theology and his political theory.

One of the points of the orthodox interpretation of Roger Williams is to stress his "seekerism" and to make it synonymous with absolute skepticism in matters of doctrine as well as of discipline. On this point several students have been misled by the fact that Williams "fell off from all Church-fellowship and then from Baptisme . . . and from all ordinances of Christ dispensed in any Churchway, till God shall stirre up himselfe or some other new Apostles."¹²

I. B. Richman, for instance, commented on Williams' seekerism: "By this solution 'discarding all theologies,' Roger Williams came as near as his age would permit, in the case of a soul at once supremely honest and truly devout, to being an Agnostic."¹³

And Brokunier, after quoting Richman's sentence, continues: "Henceforth there were no doubts, no waverings, he had found his faith—the certainty of uncertainty, disbelief in the unproved."¹⁴

H. B. Parkes held a similar view:

Williams' arguments for toleration can not be understood clearly unless we remember that he did not believe himself, or anybody else, to be in possession of the truth. Seeker and skeptic as he was he demanded "a liberty of searching after God's most Holy mind and pleasure" as a "most precious and invaluable Jewel."¹⁵

In the same vein in *The Puritans*, by Miller and Johnson, we can read: "... for the rest of his life (Williams) called himself a seeker, one who was always searching for the pure Truth but did not expect to find it in this world."¹⁶ Williams' seekerism was the heart of Ernst's interpretation, his source of inspiration and excitement, and he could not help feeling deeply moved every time he came across this idea, particularly in his second work on Williams:

The Seekerism of Roger Williams is his spiritual journey into the unknown in quest of the realization of his immortal self—his soul—broadening his consciousness, seeking a higher and higher unity, ever striving to approach nearer to one central Truth which is all-comprehensive. This journey and quest is also the central fact in the history of Mankind.¹⁷

In a previous section Ernst had struggled unsuccessfully in his endeavor to define seekerism: "The seeker religion was a strange mixture of rationalism, individualism, historical realism, inquirism and empiricism suffused by a mystic richness and warmth that give it a wide appeal."¹⁸

Elsewhere he declares:

Roger Williams was a transcendental mystic. His seeker attitude is one of inquirism and skepticism, best stated in his own words: "Try and examine all things," "Seek diligently after truth," and be "not enslaved by many corrupt lusts, examples, customs, fear of men, traditions of fathers," but ever strive to "improve the power of reason . . . and understanding." Etc.¹⁹

Apart from the stylistic and temperamental differences, these interpretations are similar in many respects. All are inconsistent with facts as well as the spirit of every book of Williams, and were made possible only by the *a priori* hypothesis of the "modernity" of Roger Williams. These biographers or historians more or less consciously relied upon an historical tradition based on very few statements made by such biased adversaries as Baillie, Cotton, C. Mather, etc., but they have neglected careful, scholarly, documented definitions of seekerism like that which we find in Masson's *Life of Milton*.²⁰ Masson never studied the whole literary production of Williams, but through a careful analysis of English culture of the 1640's he was able to avoid the kind of distortion and misunderstanding we have found in these notions about seekerism.

More important, however, is the fact that none of these historians seems aware that Williams himself left us an autobiographical account of the matter in answer to an objection *ad personam* to his doctrine of the church. During the debate at Newport between the Quakers and Roger Williams, somebody asked him why, in spite of his advocacy of the visible Church as an institution appointed by God, he was out of any church's fellowship. He answered that "among so many pretenders to be the true Christians Army and Officers of Christ Jesus" he was "in doubt unto which to associate and to left ourselves;" or, he added, "to believe that some come

nearer to the first primitive Churches and the institutions and appointment of Christ Jesus." And he concluded: "If my soul could find rest in joining unto any of the Churches professing Christ Jesus now extant I would readily and gladly do it, yea unto themselves who I now opposed."²¹

Reading this statement against the general background of the Quaker controversy, one must recognize that Roger Williams was far less "modern" than the writers above have supposed.

This makes clear that his actual disassociation from any existing religious body had nothing to do with religious individualism, and even less to do with anticlerical deism or rationalism, but a great deal to do with his personal condition: on one hand God had enlightened him sufficiently to make it impossible for him to keep worshipping with the unseparated, corrupted, "whorish" church of the Apostacy, while on the other hand, he had yet not enough light to know what was the real Church of Christ. Theoretically, however, Williams always recognized that the visible Church was appointed by Jesus Christ as a "visible kingdom" over all subjects "ordained to continue until his coming again,"²² with the purpose "to begin that eternal and heavenly communion in Heaven here in a holy and visible worship on earth."²³ The Apostolic succession was interrupted by the coming of the Apostacy with the corruption of the primitive Church and the rise of the Antichrist. During the Apostacy "the Lord hath not left the world without witness, but hath graciously and wonderfully stirred up his holy Prophets and witnesses,"²⁴ thus setting a new type of Ministry. This prophetic type of minister raised directly by God's inspiration regardless of his cultural or social conditions is the only one suitable to the present situation up to "the resurrection of the Churches."²⁵

Williams' seekerism was thus confined to problems of Church and Ministry in their temporal appearance without affecting ultimate issues of religious authority and the doctrines of the Reformation.

Prof. Woodhouse had based his hypothesis on the influence, by analogy, of the doctrine of the Church upon the democratic political doctrines of the Puritans, on the assumption that the community of believers was democratic and equalitarian. But in Williams' mind it was not. We have already referred to Williams' idea of the prophetic ministry during the Apostacy. Prophets and witnesses are stirred up by the Spirit of God, and they have "no other truly Tender but the Holy Spirit,"²⁶ regardless of external texts, social conditions, or university degrees. In the *Bloudy Tenent* Williams had already discussed the relations of the Ministers of the Church and demonstrated that "There is a ministry before the Church"²⁷ and that both historically and ideally the Ministry does not depend upon

the Church as the institutionalized body of the believers. In the *Hireling Ministry* he made clear that he objected to the democratic type of church as well as to the Apostolic succession through the Apostasy of Rome:

Notwithstanding that some plead their succession from the Apostles or Messengers, yet are they forced to run into the tents of Antichrist, and to plead succession from Rome, and neither such, nor other which plead their calling from the people, can prove to my conscience from the testimony of Christ Jesus, that either Christ's succession did run in an Antichristian line or that two or three godly persons might first make themselves a Church and then make their ministers, without a preceding Ministry from Christ Jesus unto them, and to guide them in such their administrations."²⁸

The doctrine of the Church is extremely sophisticated. In fact, it is not enough to be regenerate in order to belong to the Church of Christ. We can have Christian people who "though their hearts wake in respect of personal grace and life of Jesus, yet . . . sleep insensible of much concerning the Purity of the Lord's worship."²⁹

Godlike and regenerate persons . . . are not fitted to constitute the true Christ-Church until it hath pleased God to convince their souls of the evil of the false Church, Ministry, Worship etc. And although I confess that Godly persons are not dead but living trees, not dead but living stones and need no new regeneration . . . yet need they a mighty worke of Gods Spirit to humble and ashame them and to cause them to loathe themselves for their abominations or stinks in Gods nostrils . . ."³⁰

Williams, however, did not even discuss the problem of equality within the religious community because he believed in the prophetic ministry and in an inscrutable miraculous order of Grace within whose boundaries God grants more or less light or gifts to different people, thus creating a situation of substantial inequality among the believers themselves. The differences in gifts and light are at least twofold in so far as one generation may get a better understanding of God's will (Progressive interpretation of Scripture; Particular Providences of God toward the Puritan age, etc.) and in so far as one individual may get more divine gifts than another (for instance: the commission to be a witness.) On one hand, the lack of substantial characteristics of homogeneity and equality as well as democracy within the Church remove any possible analogy or influence; so if we are searching for sources of influence upon Williams' political thought, we must look for some other source of inspiration.

On the other hand, the problem of progressive interpretation and understanding of the divine will introduces us to the discussion on the fundamental and circumstantial matters of belief. With his historical sense, Roger Williams denied the possibility of a clear-cut distinction between the fundamentals and circumstantials,³¹ except on the elementary point held by all Puritans: that which distinguishes a Christian from a heathen is repentance from dead works and justification by faith.³² This point is taken for granted

by Williams and sets the wall of separation between the Christians and the unbelievers. At the same time these distinctions offer different grounds for toleration and freedom of conscience. To all natural men, that is, for everyone who does not recognize that the nature of man is fundamentally wicked and can be regenerated only by the Grace of God,³³ toleration is given by the Christian because of the unique character of Faith,³⁴ the impossibility of enforcing a conscience to spiritual and supernatural things,³⁵ the impossibility of forcing the hand of God himself to give His Grace to whom we choose,³⁶ and finally, because the purposes of a civil community are peace and order. But for Christians there are new problems. Williams thought that God maintained throughout the centuries the essential doctrines of Repentance and Faith but allowed his children to fall into darkness and uncertainty as to the Holy Worship and church discipline, so that among the Christians, toleration should be implied in the search that every good Christian is expected to undertake to find the true character and nature of the Church and the Holy Worship. It is here that Williams' "seekerism" and his expectation of "a greater light"³⁷ fit in.

Whatsoever structure or discipline the Church may have, within the Commonwealth she looks like any other social institution:

The Church or Company of worshippers (whether true or false) is like unto a Body or College of Physicians in the citie; like unto a corporation, society or company of East India or Turkie-Merchants . . . ; which companies may hold their courts, keep their records, hold disputations; and in matters concerning their society, may dissent, divide, break into schismes and factions, sue and implead each other at the law, yea, wholly break up and dissolve into pieces and nothing and yet the peace of the city not be in the least measure impaired or disturbed; because the essence or being of the city, and so the well-being and peace thereof is essentially distinct from those particular societies.³⁸

Williams' doctrine of the Church is even better illustrated by his discussion of the missionary problem. The conversion of the Indians and the more general issue of the Christian missions to the heathen occupied Williams' mind throughout all his life. He wrote a tract on this specific problem³⁹ and discussed and stated his views on this issue of the missions several times in his works, from the *Key to the Language of America* to *G. Fox digg'd out of his Burrowes*. In those works he openly held that it was better to leave the heathen in their bestial, natural condition than to convert them to an hypocritical Christianity. First of all, he pointed out some practical difficulties such as the mastery of their language "to such a degree . . . as to be able in property of speech to open matters of salvation to them."⁴⁰ But the main reasons were theological. One was the corruption of the churches in the present times. And on this point he thought that in the Scriptures it is plain that the battle between God and his enemy the Antichrist must be over before bringing the light

to the heathen.⁴¹ On the other side it looked like a matter of fact to him that the false Christians do not differ from the pagans except in "the aggravation of condemnation"⁴² of God. The moral customs of the heathen are no worse than the Christians', and even if those were so, that does not mean that they are farther from God than we. At the very end, however, he brings in a quite interesting argument: that of the source of authority of the apostles and preachers. Apparently Roger Williams, with the Puritans of the right wing, thought that the Apostolic succession was the sign of God's appointment, but since the apostles, he asked: Where lies "the power of sending?"⁴³ This scruple about the power of sending and the channels of the Holy Spirit through institutions once more shows that Williams belongs to the large variety of the central party of Puritanism, between the right wing and the radicals.

Williams' view of Church and Ministry is strictly bound to a "prophetic" reading of history and cannot be understood outside of an organic providential design of the historical process. The Church as the beloved spouse of Christ is the focus of attention within the historical development; the Scriptures that set the patterns of history are the love letters of Jesus to the Church.⁴⁴ And these holy Scriptures are not only the records of history but contain and preserve the prophecies and divine designs of God for the future. Williams searched into the holy Scripture for a complete providential and miraculous design of history, the climax of which would be the imminent second coming of Jesus. Toleration too was justified in terms of the mysterious operation of God's grace in history.

Unfortunately at this moment there is neither time nor space to go into the details of Williams' philosophy of history. Moreover it would be impossible to analyse his scattered and casual references to this topic without comparing it at least with some key authors of the "prophetic tradition" such as Thomas Brightman, Joseph Mede and in particular his antagonist John Cotton.

We might say that Roger Williams was a Millenarian, if we just imply that he believed in the imminent second coming of Christ, which will precede the Millennium. But several among those hated Spiritualists—the Quakers included—were Millenarian too. The "terrible day of the Lord" was the central feature of George Fox' preaching. And John Cotton, who throughout his life did not show any real sympathy for religious radicalism, not only wrote at least three commentaries on different parts of the *Revelation*, but even published two expositions of the *Book of Canticles*, interpreting it allegorically as "the prophetic history of the Church from the days of Solomon to the last judgment." Apparently reliance upon the

prophetic literature was a general practice among several Puritans of different varieties.

As a good Puritan Williams considered the Bible the primary authority and in his public debate with the Quakers the Bible was a central part of the discussion. In fact Williams wrote of the Scripture that God "in his infinite depths of his wisdom and Goodness" "has provided this heavenly record" "for the Ages and generations to come" "as the glorious appearance of the Eternal invisible King in the former generation of mankind from the creation of the world, as also the Wonders yet to be fulfilled till time should be no more, all which were in the holy Scripture."⁴⁵ Scripture is immediately inspired and therefore "every word: syllable and tittle in that Scripture or writing is the word or immediate revealed will of God."⁴⁶ The Bible is the natural means through which the Spirit of God speaks, the word appointed by Jesus until his next coming. Cautioning John Cotton against an overly strict literal interpretation, Williams warned that "in that great battle between the Lord Jesus and the Devil, it is observable that Sathan takes up the wapons of Scripture,"⁴⁷ but when he faced the Quakers he recalled that Jesus won the same combat with "no other wapon but prayer and fasting and the Holy Scripture."⁴⁸

Particularly in his *George Fox digg'd out of his Burrowes* Roger Williams had to take up the problem of the relation between Scripture and the Holy Spirit, a central concern of Puritan theology and piety.⁴⁹ For him there was no difference between the revealed Word of God and the Holy Spirit, because "the true Spirit and the Holy Scriptures are one as the Father and the Son are one"⁵⁰ and the writers of the Bible were "but Pens of Heaven writing and used by the hand of the Holy Spirit."⁵¹ Williams shared the view held by some of his fellow Puritans that the Spirit of God, which speaks through Holy Scripture, is not self-evident but must be digged out by labor and study. He held that Jesus Christ "hath given authority and power to his witnesses to search after the Holy Records, in the originall Hebrew and Greek copies"⁵² and nothing seemed to him more irresponsible and "hellish" than the "proud laziness"⁵³ and ignorance of the Quakers, especially after "the Popish inventions since the Apostacy."⁵⁴

He acknowledged that "human learning and culture" are excellent gifts of God and that "the schools of human learning ought to be maintained."⁵⁵

He condemned the Quakers for their scorn of culture as a means to God. His esteem for culture, however, did not lead him to support the established privileges of the actual institutions of learning, especially in relation to the "Ministry of Christ Jesus."⁵⁶ Thus in his

attack against the monopoly of the big universities and of the national Church in matters of biblical and theological scholarship as well as of ministerial training, Williams seemed to uphold the cause of the Puritans of the left-wing,⁵⁷ but by denying that the holy scripture can be interpreted by anybody without labor or training he associated himself with the most moderate Puritans.

Without expatiating further upon his view of the Bible we can at least say that in Williams' belief Scripture was not the sole means of revelation of the will and word of God. Once in *George Fox digg'd out of his Burrowes* he speaks of "infinite millions of millions of Gods words" according to His infinite nature:

God hath a great many words or Expressions of His mind and counsels unto Men and angels: . . . He sends out His word that is his mind or pleasure and meltheth them Psal 147. So that I affirm that the two great lights of Heaven the Sun and the Moon, and all the lesser lights, the stars are words and preaching and preachers of God to us: Every wind and cloud, and drop of rain and hail, every flake of snow, every leaf, every grass, every drop of water in the Ocean and Rivers, yea, every grain of corn and sand on the shore, is a voice or word and witness of God unto us.⁵⁸

In other passages he emphasized his belief that "God speaks mediately unto us by the light of Nature within us" and shows how God speaks either through what we call natural ordinary means like a raindrop or a breadcrumb, or through extraordinary ways, dreams, angels and so on.⁵⁹ Although it seems remarkable to me that he perceived no real gulf between nature in itself as a revelation of God and the use of nature as a means to God, there is something miraculous and divine in nature, and hence to him it is not surprising that "the Water, the Bread, and Wine, etc. are appointed by Jesus Christ to be means while profession of Christ Jesus is made on earth to hold forth a remembrance of Him until His second coming."⁶⁰ But there are stricter connections between God and Nature. Though the Spirit of God can operate by extraordinary means, He does not lead men as beasts, but rationally.

Reason therefore further saith that every soul must be satisfied, whether this leading or anointing or teaching of the spirit be by means of praying, preaching, reading, meditating, conferring etc. or immediate without the use of these: If motions without the use of these be pretended reasons tells us that a rational soul must be able to try whether the Spirit pretending to be a true or lying Spirit, and that it must have some rule or touch-stone to make their tryal by, that the rule must be my own reason or some testimony of unquestionable witnesses satisfying my reason, or some heavenly inspired scripture or writing which my reason tells me came from God.⁶¹

Thus at last our reason is the guarantee of God's operations, the means by which God reaches us. But in order better to understand in what manner the Puritan Williams argued, let us examine an example of his disputation. In opposition to the Quaker practice and theory he held that women have no right "to pretend to be Apostles."

First of all, he started his discussion of this problem by acknowledging that "in religious and Christian matters there is no respect of persons with God, as of man before the woman, otherwise than to order natural and civil" and that "the wisdom of God prefers some women before thousands of men," "yet this favor of God toward women destroys not the order which the God of Order or Nature hath set in those bounds and limits and distinctions between the Male and the Female . . . though the Holy Scriptures were silent, yet reason and experience tells us that the woman is the weaker vessel, that she is more fitted to keep and order the house and children etc. that the Lord hath given a covering of longer hair to women as a sign or teacher of covering Modesty and Bashfulness, silence and retiredness, and therefore not so fitted for many actions and employments. Therefore because of Joels Prophesie or because we must not limit or quench the Spirit, as G. Fox saith, there is not ground in Gods ordinary course of Nature to permit women to pretend to Apostles or messengers to the Nations or Preachers and teachers in the Public Assemblies."⁶²

He then numbers his reasons: (1) "Because we finde no such Commission given by Christ Jesus or any such Practice among the first Believers,"⁶³ and (2) because of the prohibitions of Scripture (Paul to the Corinthians and to Timothy etc.)

Finally he concludes:

I own that it may please the Father of Spirits in cases extraordinary, he may please to alter his common course of Nature (as in Abrahams case with Isaak) but we must not tempt God: But if God hath powrd forth the gifts of knowledge and utterance upon some women more than other they have three large fields to walk in mentioned by the Holy Scripture, viz. of their instructing their children etc. 2) As occasion justly calls them from home, of instructing other women especially the younger. 3) Of confessing boldly the name and truth of Christ Jesus, when he suffers tyrants to bring Persecution to them etc.⁶⁴

From this discussion of the rights and duties of women at least four basic principles of the Puritan mind become apparent:

- (1) The Scriptures set rules of action and belief through their explicit utterances and orders.
- (2) The Scriptures can speak also by examples, through archetypal figures and events.
- (3) When Scripture is mute reason must resort to the Principles of Nature.
- (4) The experiences of the members of the Primitive Church and those of the witnesses and martyrs of Christ Jesus during the Apostacy are another point of reference and source of inspiration and guidance.

If it were necessary for us to discuss the controversy on toleration between John Cotton and Roger Williams, we could bring in, as a valuable example of the second principle noted above, the com-

plex problem of the Archtypes in the Holy Scriptures: that is, to what extent the Scripture was normative in its types, whether the Old Testament was imperative for the Christians as was the New Testament, etc.

At any rate, these few rather unsystematic suggestions about some of the main problems of Roger Williams' Puritan mind may be sufficient to show the need for a new orientation in understanding the founder of Rhode Island.

One point still to be discussed is Williams' political philosophy. Actually it is not proposed to make a detailed analysis of Williams' political doctrines, but rather to point out some central problems and in particular to illustrate how his political theories are associated with and dependent upon Williams' Puritan theology.

The authority of the Magistrate in a Commonwealth was a very important point of controversy between the congregational non-separatists such as the Puritans of Massachusetts and the Separatists, such as Roger Williams.

In the first place, what can a Christian Magistrate do for the propagation of the Gospel of Christ Jesus? In the *Bloudy Tenent* Williams showed that a Christian Magistrate has no different duties and responsibilities than a pagan or a Mohammedan. He has to secure peace and liberty of conscience for all, according to the purpose of any magistracy and the common character of a community as source of power.⁶⁵ But in *The Hireling Ministry* he made clear that a Christian magistrate, in addition to a civil responsibility, has a religious duty to repeal persecution for religion's sake and secure freedom to anyone, because freedom is a positive contribution to the diffusion of the Gospel. As a matter of fact

the first grand Design of Christ Jesus, is to destroy, and consume his mortal enemy AntiChrist. This must be done by the breath of his Mouth in his Prophets and Witnesses: Now the Nations of the world have impiously stopt this heavenly breath, stifled the Lord Jesus in his servants. Now if it shall please the civil state to remove the state bars, set up to resist the holy spirit of God in his servants (whom yet finally to resist, is not in all powers of the world) I humbly conceive that the civil state hath made a fair progress in promoting the Gospel of Jesus Christ.⁶⁶

According to the democratic ideas of Williams, this rationale is valid for every Christian as a responsible member of the political, human society. And when Williams, in the passage above, speaks of the action of God against AntiChrist "by the breath of his mouth in the Prophets and Witnesses," he also advocates a "spiritual" as well as a supernatural, miraculous kind of religion.

But such an apocalyptical, passive expectation of the last glorious events was common even to the majority of the most violent and

activistic groups of the Puritan Revolution, who thought of their actions only as a "sign" of God's election.⁶⁷

Nowadays it is often agreed upon that Williams advocated separation between church and state and the voluntaristic character of the ecclesiastical community in order to preserve the elect from worldly and sinful contacts. But it is less understood that the realm of social natural life, although exempted by Williams from any ecclesiastical interference, still lay within a general providential design in which nobody has the right to tempt God by trying to force his hand and will.

This last point seems to me particularly worth making, because it is the foundation of the worldly achievements of the Puritans in politics, as well as in economics and society. Actually Williams and the other Puritans were waiting for the restoration of Christ's kingdom. But meanwhile they had to achieve their worldly mission in everyday life. Man has duties and responsibilities which are dependent upon his nature as man; and to be one of the elect does not excuse him from his natural duties.

A radical pessimism on the nature of man and on human destiny as such, on one hand, and an extreme confidence in God on the other hand, were the two cornerstones of Williams' philosophy.

As to the Nature of mankind, he saw "the heart of man to be naturally dark, deceitful, desperately evil and wicked."⁶⁸ In the *Experiments of Spiritual Life*, he said that sin is the "nature and element"⁶⁹ of "worldly," "unregenerate," "natural Persons" and that the political organization is simply the adequate natural means provided by God for facing the corrupted nature of mankind. Therefore, civil magistracy is necessary to secure civil order and peace; otherwise "the world would be like the sea wherein men like fishes would hunt and devour each other and the greater devour the less."⁷⁰ Thus the foundation of his political system and of the natural realm as a whole are still grounded on a Biblical outlook.

This does not necessarily imply that we should overlook in Roger Williams what belongs to natural philosophy or general revelation. Within his general religious frame there was room for a relatively autonomous realm of nature, although limited both in time and extent. In fact, the Church is a fellowship of those few elected by God to be witnesses in a corrupted world. The majority of the people have not been so lucky and under the present conditions religious standards cannot be enforced. The political community is based on men no more as believers or sinners, but as men.

I have mentioned that the political power of the community is the natural means provided by God to keep in check the wicked nature of men and to make it possible for men to live together in a

commonwealth. The evidence of history as well as of human reason shows us that this commonwealth has to be free from any religious or spiritual interference, because its purpose is entirely worldly. The civil magistracy has nothing to do with the "first table;" its authority is limited to the second table of the Divine Commandments because those are related to the natural life of men. "The second table contains the law of Nature, the law moral and civil,"⁷¹ in short, it is the natural revelation suitable to human reason. The magistrates, who embody the authority of the whole community, have to look out for peace and order by enforcing laws and punishment.

Roger Williams, however, had always a quite realistic and functional approach to policy, and his concern was not only to secure order and peace by strength of power, but to keep the magistracy in its proper function. To Williams, as well as to other contemporary publicists and jurists, the state was a "public service agent, a corporation serving a free citizenship in society."⁷² Roger Williams never felt that institutions in themselves had metaphysical value as did several others of his fellow Puritans. They thought that sovereignty was something sacred, not only because it was from God but because of its own metaphysical consistency—sovereignty both civil and religious was a power *per se*, an entity, a value regardless of the person who holds the place. This sounded silly and inconsistent to Williams:

The sovereign, original and foundation of society lies in the people . . . (and the magistracy) have not the least inch of civil power but what is measured out to them from the consent of the bodies.⁷³ . . . It is evident that such governments as are by them (the people) erected and established have not more power, nor for no longer time than the civil power or people consenting and agreeing shall betrust them with. This is cleare not only in reason but in the experience of all commonweals where the people are not deprived of the natural freedoms by the power of tyrants.⁷⁴

The community is the source of power, and it can be delegated only temporarily. Practically, community power is permanently embodied by the general assembly of the freemen and their representatives, but not "for longer time than the civil power of people consenting and agreeing shall betrust them with." And it is a right of the people to "erect and establish what form of government seemes evident to them most meete for their civil condition."⁷⁵ The community of citizens, the people, are the beginning and the end of the political process.

In spite of his scorn for corporate institutions, Williams never advocated any sort of individualism. He always saw the problems of individuals as part of those of a social body; and he might have given a little more attention to the specific problem of personal rights during the last part of his life, yet even at that time he was more concerned with the democratic decisions of the freemen than the per-

sonal liberty and political rights of the minority within a democratic organization.

In our brief discussion of Williams' political ideas we have seen that the role of the magistrate is not only to restrain evil and maintain order, but primarily to secure freedom for the Word of God. The purpose of the civic commonwealth, however, is primarily worldly; the structure of its government has to be democratic and representative; its goal is to be functional.

At this point the last major problem which remains to be discussed is the relationship between the order of Grace represented by the Church and the order of nature expressed primarily by the political commonwealth. As I have already hinted here and there Prof. Woodhouse conceived a real clear-cut distinction between these two realms and on that assumption he suggested that they may be parallel; furthermore he propounded the hypothesis that the political order, strictly democratic, was patterned by analogy after the ecclesiastical order. If my conclusions are accepted, this hypothesis is inadequate, especially in two respects:

- (1) Since the world of nature falls within the millennium scheme the distinction between the realm of Nature and the realm of Grace is not so sharply clear-cut, their separation not so absolute. The realm of Nature is related to that of Grace not only because God was "the creator and supreme ruler of them both and because they had a common subject-matter in man and a common object, the good"⁷⁶ but also because both are unconsciously part of a far more complex, divine design of history.
- (2) The principle of analogy is unsatisfactory because, as we have seen, Williams' view of the authority of the ministry is not democratic. Prof. Woodhouse has pointed out the "purely spiritual character" of Williams' religion. To be sure, Roger Williams stressed the peculiar, the unique character of religious experience; yet it is gracious, gratuitous, supernatural rather than spiritual. The word "spiritual" makes us think of a specific stream of the Reformation, that of the Spiritualists, both in England and on the Continent. Williams attacked them bitterly during this controversy with the Quakers, regardless of their kind or differences.⁷⁷

Roger Williams took his stand against and attacked vehemently the national or established type of Church, such as the persecuting churches of Old and New England; yet he never objected to the visible church and to the efficacy of other visible means, as has been previously demonstrated. In short, Williams' theology was too com-

plex to fit in a frame as simplified as that suggested by Prof. Woodhouse.

If the interpretation suggested in this article is adequate, it raises a variety of historical problems. First of all there is the problem of the originality and origins of Williams' ideas. Were his political ideas really new and if so how are they related to the history of political thought, both within and without Puritan groups? Are Williams' political concepts and religious ideas within the same stream of thought? Are they logically connected and related, or is there merely an artificial, fortuitous combination?

The answer to these questions demands more than familiarity with Roger Williams' writings and life, it involves the political thought of the 17th century as well as the more precise problem of the Puritan contribution to the genesis of modern democratic ideas. Roger Williams was a man bound to his own age; his problems were the problems of his contemporaries, and his answers were always related to them and to their concerns. As a matter of fact, he was aware of and proud to live in those lucky days so rich in Divine Providence. And he felt a great responsibility to his own society. Many students of Williams, far less gifted with the historical sense, pathetically fail in their task, mainly because they try to make of Williams a man of a different age.

In recent years substantial progress has been made toward a better understanding of the complexities of seventeenth century culture and society. But too many figures and problems, and especially their interrelations, have still to be explored and fully understood. Few historical situations are richer in contrasts. And in the complexity of his mind, Williams is indeed a son of his age.

So far as our research can show, he was a Puritan in his theology; even his Seekerism in the realm of polity did not affect his solid, theological conservatism. Politically Williams was not only a progressive and a liberal, an irrepressible democrat at heart, but also a gifted theorist. His contributions to political thinking and practice have been only summarily sketched here; only through a comparative study of his contemporaries who wrote on politics and law, and against the whole background of English political heritage and medieval thought, can Williams be fully understood and evaluated. At the same time, I hope I have made it clear that Williams' political thought must be considered within his intellectual frame of reference, which was primarily theological and religious.

- 1 James D. Knowles: *Memoir of Roger Williams*, p. ix, Boston, 1834.
- 2 H. B. Parkes: "J. Cotton and Roger Williams Debate Toleration" in the *New England Quarterly*, Vol. IV (1931), p. 736.
- 3 J. E. Ernst: *The Political Thought of Roger Williams*, Seattle, 1929.
- 4 J. E. Ernst, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
- 5 J. E. Ernst, *Roger Williams, New England Firebrand*, 1932, pp. 491-92.
- 6 See also J. E. Ernst, *The Political Thought of Roger Williams* pp. 81-82.
- 7 P. M. Miller and T. H. Johnson, *The Puritans*, 1938, p. 186.
- 8 *Tracts of Liberty in the Puritan Revolution*, edited with a commentary by William Haller, Vol. I, pp. 58, 60.
- 9 W. K. Jordan, *The Development of Religious Toleration in England*, Vol. III (1640-60), pp. 475-77.
- 10 Arthur Barker's study of Roger Williams' thought in his *Milton and the Puritan Dilemma*, 1640-60, (1942), is merely a detailed application of Woodhouse's interpretative ideas and hypotheses.
- 11 "As to matters in difference between yourselves and me I have willingly omitted them as knowing that many able and honest seamen in their observations of the Sun (our picture of Christ Jesus) differ sometimes in their reckonings, though uprightly aiming at and bound for one port and harbor. I humbly beg of you (1) that you will more and more earnestly, candidly and Christianly study the things that differ without reflecting upon credit, maintenance, liberty, and life itself, remembering who it was that said, he that love his life shall lose it, (2) more and more study the prophesies and the signs of the times." From the Introductory Address to R. Baxter and J. Owen in *George Fox digg'd out of his Burrowes*, quoted in Backus, *op. cit.*, I, p. 355.
- 12 J. Cotton, *Master J. Cotton answer to Master R. Williams*, N. C. P., Vol. II, p. 11. The Narragansett Club republished in six volumes the major writings of Roger Williams (Providence, R. I., 1866-1874.). The contents of this collection are as follows:
 - (1) A key into the language of America; Letter of Mr. John Cotton; Mr. Cotton's letter . . . examined and answered.
 - (2) John Cotton answer to R. Williams; queries of highest consideration.
 - (3) The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution for cause of conscience.
 - (4) The Bloudy Tenent yet more bloudy.
 - (5) George Fox digg'd out of his Burrowes.
 - (6) Letters.In the essay this collection is always noted "N.C.P. Vol.—."
- 13 I. B. Richman, *Rhode Island, its making and meaning*, 1902-1, p. 111.
- 14 S. H. Brokuniier, *The Irrepressible democrat, R. Williams*, 1940, p. 123.
- 15 H. B. Parkes, in *New England Quarterly* (1931), Vol. IV, p. 751.
- 16 P. M. Miller and T. H. Johnson; *The Puritans*, 1938, p. 215.
- 17 J. E. Ernst, *Roger Williams, New England Firebrand*, 1932, p. 492.
- 18 J. E. Ernst, *ibid.*, p. 227.
- 19 J. E. Ernst, *Roger Williams, New England Firebrand*, 1932, p. 491.
- 20 D. Masson, *The Life of John Milton*, Vol. III, p. 153.
- 21 N.C.P., Vol. V, pp. 103-5.
- 22 N.C.P., Vol. V, p. 101-2. See also pp. 177, 100.
- 23 Roger Williams, *The Hireling Ministry none of Christ's*, published as an appendix to *A review of the "Correspondence" of Messrs. Fuller and Wyland on the subject of American Slavery*, Utica, N. Y., 1847, p. 162.
- 24 *Hireling Ministry*, p. 163.
- 25 *Hireling Ministry*, p. 164.
- 26 *Ibid.*, p. 164.
- 27 N.C.P., Vol. III, p. 293. See all Chap. CIII.
- 28 *Hireling Ministry*, p. 166.
- 29 *Mr. Cotton's letter examined and answered*, N.C.P. Vol. I, p. 51.
- 30 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 56.
- 31 N.C.P., Vol. III, p. 64.
- 32 N.C.P., Vol. V, p. 177.
- 33 N.C.P., Vol. V, p. 414.
- 34 N.C.P., Vol. III, p. 138.
- 35 N.C.P., Vol. III, pp. 286ff.
- 36 N.C.P., Vol. III, p. 258.
- 37 N.C.P., Vol. III, p. 206; *Queries of highest consideration*, N.C.P., Vol. II, p. 33.
- 38 N.C.P., Vol. III, p. 72.
- 39 *Christenings make not Christians as a briefe discourse concerning that name Heathen.*
- 40 *Christenings make not Christians, Rhode Island Historical Tracts*, No. XIV, Providence, R. I., 1881, p. 18.
- 41 *Christenings make not Christians*, p. 20.
- 42 *Ibid.*, p. 8.
- 43 *Christenings make not Christians*, p. 20; cf *The Hireling Ministry*, p. 174.
- 44 N.C.P., Vol. V, p. 143.
- 45 N.C.P., Vol. V, p. 51; cf p. 336.
- 46 N.C.P., Vol. V, p. 387.
- 47 N.C.P., Vol. III, p. 84.
- 48 N.C.P., Vol. V, p. 144.
- 49 Incidentally, I would like to remark here again that on this point as well as on several others touching the fundamental issue at stake, Williams gives the reader the feeling that he is not speaking for himself alone, but for all the Puritans, for all the Protestants. This is not equally perceptible in the other works of Williams.
- 50 N.C.P., Vol. V, p. 136.

- 51 N.C.P., Vol. V, p. 137.
- 52 N.C.P., Vol. V, p. 147.
- 53 N.C.P., Vol. V, p. 403.
- 54 N.C.P., Vol. V, pp. 388, 390.
- 55 *Hireling Ministry*, pp. 171-2.
- 56 *Ibid.*, pp. 171-5.
- 57 On this point Williams' views were quite similar to the ideas of several "left-wing" Puritans. For a detailed discussion of this problem, see D. B. Robertson, *The Religious Foundations of Leveller Democracy*, New York, 1951, Chap. II; particularly the section on Scripturalism and anti-intellectualism.
- 58 N.C.P., Vol. V, p. 445.
- 59 N.C.P., Vol. V, pp. 290-1. For those who think that there is a difference between the works Williams wrote for publication and his personal letters (and in the latter he does undoubtedly look like a "modern" man, "the prophet of tomorrow") I would like to quote from a letter addressed to one of his correspondents about the comet of 1680: "Black clouds (some years) have hung over Old and New England heads. God hath been wonderfully patient and long suffering to us but who sees not changes and calamities hanging over us? . . . All men fear that this blazing herald from heaven denounceth from the Most High, wars, pestilence, famine, is it not then our wisdom to make and keep peace with God and man?" To Daniel Abbot, Jan. 15, 1680, quoted in Backus, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 413-4.
- 60 N.C.P., Vol. V, p. 290.
- 61 N.C.P., Vol. V, p. 127.
- 62 N.C.P., Vol. V, pp. 360-61.
- 63 N.C.P., Vol. V, p. 361.
- 64 N.C.P., Vol. V, p. 363.
- 65 N.C.P., Vol. III, pp. 354-5.
- 66 *Hireling Ministry*, p. 179.
- 67 See W. S. Hudson, "Economic and social thought of Gerrard Winstanley," in *Journal of Modern History*, Vol. XVIII (1943), esp. pp. 5-10.
- 68 N.C.P., Vol. V, p. 134.
- 69 R. Williams, *Experiments of Spiritual Life and Health*, S. S. Rider ed., Providence, R. I., 1863, p. 37.
- 70 N.C.P., Vol. III, p. 398.
- 71 N.C.P., Vol. III, p. 358.
- 72 J. E. Ernst, *The political thought of Roger Williams*, p. 137.
- 73 N.C.P., Vol. III, p. 366. Cf p. 343.
- 74 N.C.P., Vol. III, pp. 249-50.
- 75 N.C.P., Vol. III, p. 249.
- 76 A. S. P. Woodhouse, *Puritanism and Liberty*, p. 39.
- 77 N.C.P., Vol. V, p. 414.

RESEARCH IN NORTHWEST CHURCH HISTORY

MARTIN SCHMITT, *University of Oregon Library*

The study of church history in the Pacific Northwest—that is, in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and British Columbia—would seem, at first glance, to be less rewarding than similar study in another region. The Pacific Northwest has never been the center of great religious excitement, or the place of origin for consequential and sustained doctrinal viewpoints. The region did produce one of the important latter-day Indian cults, the Ghost Dance, or Messiah craze, and the region does harbor "Psychiana," in Moscow, Idaho. At one time there were religious communistic societies in the area, best known of which is probably the Aurora colony, in Oregon. But by and large, the Pacific Northwest cannot be styled a center of religious originality.

Ecclesiastical history in this region is likely to be a study of the foundings of congregations, the problems of administration of congregations and denominations, and the inter-relationships between rival or cooperating denominations and sects. The pleasant and challenging questions of doctrine, scriptural interpretation, and exegesis, while not completely unknown in the Pacific Northwest, are not native to it, except, perhaps, in a study of religion among the Indians on the reservations. In general, the congregation, the denomination and the influence of the church on the region call for the attention of the church historian.

Examination of the literature of church history in the Pacific Northwest on the shelves of the large libraries indicates that there are three or four definite published types. There is, first, the denominational history, recently represented by William Wallace Youngson's *Swinging Portals*. Second, there are published histories of congregations. Such congregational histories are usually produced as a by-product of anniversary celebrations, or in connection with the dedication of new church physical plants. There are 25th, 50th, and, recently, centennial histories of congregations. Most such histories are obscure, of minor importance, and of inconsequent scholarship. They are, of course, better than nothing, because they often rescue facts from complete oblivion. They are also very difficult to find, because, being programs or church bulletins, they are not systematically sent to libraries.

Biographies, autobiographies, and reminiscences form the third major type of published Pacific Northwest church history. The

majority of such works deal with figures of the early, pioneer, missionary period. Biographies of Jason Lee, Marcus Whitman, Francis N. Blanchet, and the other giants of territorial days are most common.

A fourth type of church history on library shelves may be called the propaganda pamphlet, the pamphlet of a religious, anti-religious, sectarian, and for that matter often malicious nature. An example of this type of publication is *The Roman Catholic Kingdom and the Ku Klux Klan*, written and published by George Estes in 1923.

Unpublished church history in the form of scholarly dissertations assumes much the same outline as published history. The entries in Eric Bromberg's *Bibliography of Theses and Dissertations Concerning the Pacific Northwest and Alaska* indicate that theses on the subject of Northwest church history fall into three general classifications: histories of congregations, histories of denominations, and biographies.

It is a little surprising, not to say disconcerting, to discover that up to 1950, only twenty-three theses were written in the field of church history in the Pacific Northwest. Of these twenty-three, nine treat Catholic subjects, two Congregational, one Church of Christ, one Hebrew, four Methodist, two Presbyterian, one Latter Day Saints, one Lutheran, and two deal with early missions in general. We have, then, in thesis form, eight denominations represented as subjects for research in church history. Considering the number of denominations active in Oregon and Washington alone, almost 60 at the last count, one is tempted to inquire, "Where are the nine?"

More suggestive than the small number of theses on Pacific Northwest church history is the lack of variety, or lack of cosmopolitanism in subject matter. Church history in this region has been limited to histories of congregations, denominations, and to biographical forms. There are, we may agree, other subjects that might be called church history.

Before suggesting what else might be attempted in the domain of ecclesiastical history, an examination of the source material ought to be made. Even a very general canvass of the research material available for Pacific Northwest church history indicates that here is a subject which offers much, and whose offerings have generally been ignored.

For the purposes of this presentation, we may divide church history sources into official, or ecclesiastical sources, and unofficial, or lay sources. Ecclesiastical sources are those which emanate from the church at all levels. Lay sources are those which are provided by organizations or persons outside the traditional framework of the church.

Ecclesiastical sources appear on three levels: the first, that of the congregation or parish, the second, the state or regional body, and third, that of the national or international level.

A recent check of the current church records kept by the various congregations in Eugene, Oregon, indicates that all churches do keep records, but that there is very little uniformity in their practices. Perhaps the most common records of congregations are the statistics of births, baptisms, marriages, and church memberships—what one might call the vital statistics of a church. The importance of birth and marriage records has perhaps declined, now that the state and federal governments have instituted fairly uniform laws concerning birth and marriage registrations. The records are, however, still faithfully kept.

Minutes of congregation meetings, meetings of boards, and minutes of any bodies that exercise administrative control over congregation matters are a second, fairly common type of record at the congregation level. The making and preserving of such records is not too carefully done, being at the mercy of the variable diligence and understanding of secretaries who change from time to time. The value of a complete file of such minutes is often not appreciated, and old minutes are sometimes destroyed as worthless, of no current value, and no future importance.

Annual reports, both by ministers and clerical or lay assistants are usually offered to a congregation, but are rarely published, either in printed or mimeographed form. Such reports are often typed, and orally presented, and incorporated, in more or less complete form, in the minutes of meetings.

In 1937 the *Pacific Northwest Historical Quarterly* published the results of two surveys of church archives made by WPA in Seattle and Spokane, Washington. These surveys substantiate what was determined locally, in Eugene, Oregon, namely that church records consist most often of vital statistics, Sunday school records, occasional published reports, and miscellaneous records. The same information, in unpublished form, is available for churches in Oregon, in the WPA Historical Records Survey files at the University of Oregon Library.

Now and then a congregation publishes a weekly periodical, or an annual or semi-annual pastoral letter. Such publication is comparatively rare, however, and should not be taken for granted by a church historian in search of source materials. Even more rare, at least in the Pacific Northwest, is a manuscript file, or a publication of sermons. Years ago the First Presbyterian church of Portland issued what it called the *Pulpit of the First Presbyterian Church*, an occasionally published pamphlet series containing the text of a sermon

preached at the church. The value of such a publication to religious history is obvious. Collections of sermons have appeared from time to time, such as I. D. Driver's *Biblical Lectures before the YMCA*, Portland, 1888, or, more recently, Elwood J. Bulgin's *Eleven Selected Sermons; Bulgin's Best Blows*, Portland, 1928. Individual printed sermons are more common, but not to an extent that would make possible a study of the change in sermon content or emphasis.

In general, the records of a congregation vary in direct proportion to the complexity of organization, and to the amount of autonomy enjoyed by the congregation with respect to national church bodies. There is, the historian regrets, no apparent awareness of the historical importance or value of church records. This conclusion can be drawn mainly because of the lack of that cornerstone of records, the annual report.

When congregations fail to appreciate the importance of annual reports, it is not surprising to find that the correspondence files of ministers, particularly the administrative correspondence, is either missing or greatly depleted. The correspondence of a minister seems to leave with him when he goes to a new parish, or is destroyed when he dies. The memory of the minister in the congregation lives through those persons whom he has converted, married, whose baptismal certificate he has signed, or through other spiritual services. The minister is secured in the history of the congregation by a biographical sketch in some anniversary publication. In short, from a spiritual point of view, his memory is blessed, but from a secular, historical point of view, his memory is lost with his papers.

The correspondence, diaries, and other papers of the missionaries of territorial and early statehood days seem to have survived in appreciable quantities in both public and private collections. The University of Oregon Library, for instance, recently obtained the diaries and letters of Isom Cranfill, Primitive Baptist preacher of Oregon, and the diaries of Moses A. Williams, Presbyterian minister in Southern Oregon from 1852-1890. Perhaps the letters and papers of the worthy successors to these missionaries will be found and preserved some day, but the attitude of local congregations toward records militates against such a hope. Future historians will conclude that either there were no great men in the Pacific Northwest church after the days of the missionaries, or that we have all fallen into the error of believing that fairly recent material is not history.

Church records on a regional or state level are, generally speaking, available only for those denominations having more complex organizations, with regional conferences, conventions, dioceses, presbyteries, etc. The regional office of any given denomination gathers statistical and administrative information, publishes such information,

issues minutes of regional meetings, and, in general, is actively engaged in what historians consider useful publication ventures. Occasionally, a regional body publishes a periodical. Such periodicals come and go as rapidly as editorial talent waxes and wanes.

As an example of regional activity, we may take the Episcopal church, diocese of Oregon. This regional office publishes an annual journal of the annual convention, a weekly bulletin, and a bi-monthly magazine. The Methodist church in Oregon publishes a yearbook of the Oregon conference, a Pacific Coast issue of the *Christian Advocate*, and an occasional newsletter by the District Superintendent. The Methodists used to do better, from the point of view of the historian, when they published the *Pacific Christian Advocate* in Oregon for over 75 years, beginning in 1855. This paper, "Devoted to Religion, Temperance, Agriculture, Education, and General Intelligence," has, as a source of church history, no counterpart in the Pacific Northwest today.

For the older, established denominations, the ramifications of official publications are almost infinite. Considerable bibliographical research could be done with profit on the official publications of any one of the denominations which has been in the Pacific Northwest for the past century. Serial and periodical publications of state and regional church bodies have come and gone with confusing irregularity. Annual reports have appeared in several forms, were published in numerous locations, and were issued by many or any of several branches of one denomination. The Baptist church is, for example, particularly complicated in its publication history. Seven distinct Baptist Associations published proceedings from 43 different locations during the twenty years from 1851-1870. This is only a partial list, because association proceedings of the early days have not all come to light.

In the publications of regional or state bodies, we may expect to find vital statistics, reports of congregations, administrative decisions on a state or regional level, and, less frequently, discussion of doctrinal questions. The records of regional offices suffer from the same lack of historical continuity that plagues the records of local congregations. Correspondence is not preserved, the officers of the organizations, bishops, secretaries, superintendents, etc., change frequently. It seems to the anxious historian that the first act of a new bishop is to cremate the administrative remains of his predecessor.

Northwest churches are represented on a national level first by their appearance in yearbooks, and similar directories issued by national church groups. For autonomous denominations, such as the Open Bible Standard and Four-Square Gospel churches, such national records are the only ones available above the level of the congregation.

National church periodicals are sometimes published with special regional inserts, such as the *Lutheran Witness*, and, until recently, the Oregon edition of the *Missionary Herald* of the Congregational church.

For much of the early missionary activity in the Pacific Northwest, the records and publications of national groups are the only source of information. There are, for instance, the proceedings of the American Baptist Home Missionary Society, the files of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and the reports in the Annals of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith. For the pioneer period, too, letters and reports from Northwest missionaries published in eastern church periodicals, or on file in the archives of national church headquarters, provide the major source of information. As Pacific Northwest churches tend to become self-supporting and more highly organized on a regional level, the national records decrease in value, and more primary sources appear in a lower echelon.

International records are important only to the Catholic church. The high complexity of organization of the Catholic church, and the consequent scattering of official records from Canada to Rome to New York to Portland and Seattle, or to the headquarters of any of the many religious orders, makes the study of Catholic church history a particularly difficult subject. So complicated, in fact, is Catholic church history that an attempt to study it on the basis of official records would, in my estimation, be folly for anyone not of the Catholic clergy. Even for the clergy, there are obstacles. It is not easy, for example, for a member of the Society of Jesus to have access to the records of, say, the Oblates of St. Francis.

Unofficial or lay sources of Pacific Northwest church history are found in surprising variety. One of the most important of such sources is, of course, the decennial census of religious bodies, which appeared in 1906, 1916, 1926, and 1936. We can but hope it will be taken again. Local church censuses or canvasses are taken among the urban population almost annually, but never seem to be published.

The files of the Interior department, United States government, are an almost untouched source of Northwest church history. In these files is buried the story of the bitter battles fought by various denominations for exclusive rights to the souls of the Indians, and for control of the reservations.

Newspapers are an obvious source of church history, particularly for the social aspects of the church. Letters and diaries of laymen are an unappreciated source of ecclesiastical information. Any lengthy correspondence file is bound to contain references to

religious affairs, sometimes in intimate detail. Personal reminiscences are very important for a study of church history. Almost every man who reaches the age where he wants to reminisce on paper finds a place for religious experiences, or at least for a pious paragraph concerning his church.

One rather odd source of information on churches is the Chamber of Commerce publication. In the days when Chambers of Commerce and Commercial Clubs in the Pacific Northwest issued pamphlets designed to attract the immigrant, the churches usually managed to be listed among the attractions of a community. Chamber of Commerce correspondence files, too, contain much information about the activity of local congregations, their interest in zoning laws, liquor regulation, gambling, race relations, and other community questions.

The records of lay groups within a church, or controlled by church groups, such as the YMCA, YWCA, WCTU, Good Will Industries, Salvation Army, or the old Portland Seamen's Friend Society—all are useful in a wide study of church history.

The records of ministerial associations, a fairly recent development in the Pacific Northwest, have never been examined as a source of church history. Much could be done with such records in a study of the demonstrable influence of church bodies on the mores of a community.

The archives of educational institutions supported by denominations are of course very important to church history. Such archives are surprisingly scarce, even for those schools still actively allied with the church. For those schools which are either defunct, or which have lost their denominational character, records have often been scattered, or lost beyond recovery.

The importance of lay or unofficial sources ought to be fairly obvious. However, such sources are often overlooked when church history is written. Lay sources especially should not be overlooked, because they tend to balance the exuberance of church history based entirely on ecclesiastical records.

This short resumé of official and unofficial sources of church history in the Pacific Northwest indicates that there is a large body of material available to historians. However, not much church history has been written. Why is this the case? Four major difficulties suggest themselves.

First, there is denominational preoccupation. There is a traditional tendency to feel that the history of religion in the Pacific Northwest is the history of the Methodists, the Presbyterians, the Catholics, the Episcopalians. This attitude renders church history unattractive to competent students who are anxious to work on broader topics, and are not motivated by sectarian zeal.

Second, this region is handicapped by an over-concern with the missionary period. True, the missionary days have drama, special interest, and, best of all, perhaps the largest collected body of original source material available. But students today like to write on subjects of more recent date, and it is becoming fashionable to say that the pioneer period has been over-written, and should be left alone for a generation.

Third, research workers have considerable difficulty with the technical aspects of church history. A student of ecclesiastical affairs is faced with a sort of religious jargon, with complicated administrative procedures and protocols completely foreign to anything in his previous experience. Such an obstacle hinders the interest of prospective church historians.

The greatest single deterrent to the writing of church history in the Pacific Northwest is the scattered condition of the source material. To write acceptable church history involves the expense of traveling to many congregations to examine records, to various state or regional headquarters for information from church archives, and even to national headquarters for the source material there available.

Genuine interest in church history could be revived or increased if studies were directed away from purely administrative history toward social history, across denominational lines, and toward problems of more nearly current interest in the Pacific Northwest. An even greater incentive would be the centralization of source material. To that end, churches would serve themselves well if they would nominate certain educational institutions, preferably universities with strong graduate programs, in the Pacific Northwest, to receive all publications of all congregations and regional bodies. Such institutions would receive all annual reports, all periodicals, and conference minutes, all published sermons. A long-range program of micro-filming unpublished records could then augment the deposit of printed material, and provide a genuine, challenging opportunity for a revival of research in church history in the Pacific Northwest.

SURVEY OF RECENT LITERATURE

RECENT ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY

The most conspicuous feature of the British religious scene during the past few years has been the attention devoted to a re-examination of the various Christian traditions in the light of a deep running interest in Christian unity, and this, in turn, has resulted in an extensive literature of historical and theological discussion. The Archbishop of Canterbury's sermon in 1946, "A Step Forward in Church Relations," provided a strong stimulus in this direction and led to renewed conversations between representatives of the Archbishop and of the Evangelical Free Churches in England, as well as with representatives of the Church of Scotland. The Archbishop had proposed that any plans for organic union be laid aside and that the churches pursue "a process of assimilation, of growing alike . . . towards a free and unfettered exchange of life in worship and sacrament. . . . My longing is, not yet that we should be *united* with other Churches in this country, but that we should grow to *full communion* with them." *Church Relations in England* (1950) is the report of the conclusions reached by the representatives of the Archbishop and the Free Churches, and serves primarily to identify the issues involved in the adoption of any policy of intercommunion. It also includes the text of the Archbishop's sermon, as does the Scottish report, *Conference on Intercommunion with Representatives of the Church of England* (Church of Scotland Publications, 1951). The issues involved in intercommunion have been further discussed by E. C. Derwick, *A Review of Attitudes towards the Problem of Intercommunion* (Holywell Press, 1950); Nathaniel Micklem, *Congregationalism and Episcopacy* (Independent Press, 1951);

H. Cunliffe-Jones, "The Church of England and the English Evangelical Free Churches," *Congregational Quarterly* (Oct., 1951); F. A. Cockin and E. G. Selwyn, "Church Relations in England," *Theology* (June, 1951); A. W. Adams, "Christian Reunion," *Modern Churchman* (Sept., 1951); Vincent Taylor, "The Church and the Ministry," *Expository Times* (June, 1951); and Matthew Black, "The Doctrine of the Ministry," *ibid.* (Jan., 1952). Quite obviously one of the major issues is the question of episcopal ordination. Norman Sykes, *The Church of England and Non-Episcopal Churches in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, 'Theology' Occasional Papers, N. S., No. 11 (S.P.C.K., 1948) assembles evidence to demonstrate that matters of church order were not regarded as of fundamental importance by Anglican divines for the first century and a half after the Reformation. He points out that the reformed churches of the Continent were recognized as true churches and their ministries and sacraments as valid. Even the imposition of episcopacy in Scotland did not involve reordination for those consecrated bishops.

Intercommunion (S. C. M. Press, 1951) is one of the brief studies prepared by the Theological Commission of the Faith and Order section of the World Council of Churches for the Conference at Lund. *The Church* (1951) and *Ways of Worship* (1951) are the other two studies in this series. The latter is especially pertinent to the Archbishop's concern for it gives a comprehensive review of the differences in worship which hinder the movement toward unity among the churches. More specialized attention is given this theme by Horton Davies, *The Worship of the English Puritans*

(Dacre Press, 1948); John Bishop, *Methodist Worship: In Relation to Free Church Worship* (Epworth Press, 1950); and W. D. Maxwell, *The Book of Common Prayer and the Worship of the Non-Anglican Churches* (Oxford University Press, 1950). "From 1817 onwards," writes Maxwell, "the direct influence of the Prayer Book predominates in the great majority of non-Anglican Service Books."

The Archbishop's sermon also elicited a series of statements giving the views of Anglo-Catholic, Evangelical, and Free Church theologians with regard to the differences, as they understood them, between the Catholic and Protestant traditions. *Catholicity* (Dacre Press, 1947) presented the Anglo-Catholic view and was immediately charged with gravely misinterpreting at many points the position of the churches issuing from the Reformation. *The Catholicity of Protestantism* (Lutterworth Press, 1950), edited by R. N. Flew and R. E. Davies for the Free Church theologians, is a penetrating analysis of the essential genius of the Reformation as it finds expression in the Free Churches; while *The Fullness of Christ: The Church's Growth into Catholicity* (S.P.C.K., 1950) is the response of the Evangelicals. Stephen Neill, Max Warren, and the other contributors to the latter volume exhibit an irenic appreciation of both traditions and suggest that in a united church tension must always exist between 'Catholic' and 'Protestant' elements. While Christ is not "tied to one particular form" of ministry, nevertheless, they conclude, the 'historic episcopate' is necessary in any reunion scheme.

These important statements have been supplemented by other studies which have been appearing over the past few years. C. F. Garbett, *The Claims of the Church of England* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1947) provoked a response by H. Townsend, *The Claims of the Free Churches* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1949), and G. D. Henderson, *The Claims of the Church of Scotland* (Hodder and

Stoughton, 1951). Ernest A. Payne, *The Free Church Tradition in the Life of England* (S.C.M. Press, 1944, rev. ed., 1951) was supplemented by a parallel study, A. T. P. Williams, *The Anglican Tradition in the Life of England* (S.C.M. Press, 1947). The individual Free Church traditions are discussed by Henry Carter, *The Methodist Heritage* (Epworth Press, 1951); Franz Hildebrandt, *From Luther to Wesley* (Lutterworth Press, 1951), E. A. Payne, *The Fellowship of Believers: Baptist Thought and Practice Yesterday and Today* (Kingsgate Press, 1944); N. Micklem, *Congregationalism and the Church Catholic* (Independent Press, 1943); J. Marsh, ed., *Congregationalism Today* (Independent Press, 1943); and C. J. Cadoux, *The Congregational Way* (Blackwell, 1946). Indicative of an increasing self-consciousness among Congregationalists is the leadership they are providing in sponsoring the publication of the works of the Puritan "Fathers"—Cartwright, Harrison, Browne, Barrow, Greenwood, and Penry. *Cartwrightiana*, ed. by A. Peel and L. H. Carlson (Allen and Unwin, 1951) is the first volume to be published. For those interested in a minor current in Scottish religious life, F. Goldie, *A Short History of the Episcopal Church in Scotland* (S.P.C.K., 1952) will be of real value.

L. E. Elliott-Binns, "The Evangelical Tradition," *Church Quarterly Review* (July-September, 1951) calls attention to the importance of the Evangelical contribution to the life of the Church of England in discussing M. L. Loane, *Oxford and the Evangelical Succession* (Lutterworth Press, 1951), and W. E. M. Brown, *The Polished Shaft* (S.P.C.K., 1951). The former volume deals with five of the great early leaders of Evangelicalism—George Whitefield, John Newton, Thomas Scott, Richard Cecil, and Daniel Wilson. The latter volume deals with the Evangelical influence in the field of literature. Contributing to this same interest is G. C. B. Davies, *The Early Cornish Evangelicals, 1735-1760* (S.P.C.K., 1951), major attention being devoted to those men who

refused to accept the leadership of Wesley. To Samuel Walker of Truro, Wesley put the question: "Shall Methodists leave the Church of England?" "By permitting lay preaching," Walker replied, "you have already begun to separate." G. T. Roberts, *Howell Harris* (Epworth Press, 1951) is the biography of the greatest of the Welsh Evangelicals who inaugurated an experiment in Christian Communism which lasted almost a century.

R. S. Boshier, *The Making of the Restoration Settlement: The Influence of the Laudians, 1649-1662* (Oxford University Press, 1951) and H. Maynard Smith, *Henry VIII and the Reformation* (Macmillan, 1948) are both careful historical studies which seek to rehabilitate Anglicanism during two decisive periods which are not entirely creditable. The first acknowledges the extensive duplicity and deceit which made possible the Restoration Settlement but contends that the end justified the means. Its major thesis concerning the role of Clarendon should be checked against the argument of B. H. G. Wormald, *Clarendon: Politics, History and Religion* (Cambridge University Press, 1951). H. Maynard Smith's volume has many excellencies but unduly emphasizes the indigenous character of the English Reformation and tends to minimize the significance of the King's motivations. By far the ablest and most discerning interpretation of the English Reformation is T. M. Parker's little volume, *The English Reformation to 1558* (Oxford University Press, 1950). Philip Hughes, *The Reformation in England*, Vol. I, *The King's Proceedings* (Macmillan, 1951) is a Roman Catholic account of the Henrician Settlement which is quite surprisingly fair, but fails to display the careful objectivity and balanced scholarship which was so conspicuous in the earlier study of the Reformation in England by the French Catholic, Abbé Constant. Gordon Rupp, *Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition* (Cambridge University Press, 1947) views the same period from a distinctly Protestant perspective. F. E.

Hutchinson, *Cranmer and the English Reformation* (English Universities Press, 1951) insists that Cranmer's effort to secure a Bible in English for the laity represents a greater contribution to the Reformation in England than his share in the composition of the Prayer Book.

At the heart of all discussions of reunion are the doctrines of the church, the ministry, and the sacraments, all of which are stressed in A. E. J. Rawlinson, *Problems of Reunion* (Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1950). Among the important recent books and articles on these three topics are the following. The Church: R. N. Flew, *Jesus and His Church* (Epworth Press, 1938; 2nd ed., 1943); George Johnston, *The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament* (Cambridge University Press, 1943); A. G. Hebert, *The Form of the Church* (Faber and Faber, 1944); T. W. Manson, "The New Testament Basis of the Doctrine of the Church," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* (April, 1950); E. A. Payne, *The Fellowship of Believers* (Kingsgate Press, 1944); G. D. Henderson, *Church and Ministry; A Study in Scottish Experience* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1951); *The Nature of the Church According to the Witness of the Society of Friends* (Friend's House, 1945; 2nd ed., 1950). The Ministry: K. E. Kirk, ed., *The Apostolic Ministry: Essays on the History and Doctrine of Episcopacy* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1946); Daniel Jenkins, *The Gift of the Ministry* (Faber and Faber, 1947); Stephen Neill, ed., *The Ministry of the Church* (Canterbury Press, 1947); T. W. Manson, *The Church's Ministry* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1948); G. W. H. Lampe, "The Early Church and the Ministry," *Modern Churchman* (Sept., 1951); T. S. Garrett, "The Ministry in Scripture and Tradition with Reference to Church Union," *Theology* (April, 1951); E. A. Payne, "Free Church Objections to Episcopacy," *Theology* (June, 1951). The Sacraments: John C. Bowmer, *The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in Early Methodism* (Dacre Press, 1951); *The Lord's Supper* (Carey-

Kingsgate Press), a statement of Baptist doctrine and practice; R. R. Osborn, *Holy Communion in the Church of England* (Lutterworth Press, 1949); J. E. L. Oulton, *Holy Communion and Holy Spirit* (S.P.-C. K., 1951).

The sacrament of baptism occupies a unique position in terms of current interest, for the widespread discussion centering around the rite has not been provoked primarily by ecumenical conversations. The concern of many Anglicans at this point was aroused by a growing awareness of the laxity surrounding the practice of infant baptism in the Church of England, a laxity which was highlighted by the report of the Joint Committee of Canterbury and York on Baptism and Confirmation, *Confirmation Today* (Publications Board of the Church of England, 1944). This report revealed the existing vagueness of theological definition with regard to both baptism and confirmation, and it elicited vigorous theological discussion. Further impetus was provided by the recognition of the problem created by a disintegrating Christian society, by the renewed emphasis upon Biblical theology, and especially by the impact of Karl Barth's *Die kirchliche Lehre von der Taufe* (1943), *The Teaching of the Church regarding Baptism*, trans. E. A. Payne (S.C.M. Press, 1948). A second report of the Joint Committee, *Baptism Today*, was published in 1949, and in the meantime the Archbishop of Canterbury had appointed a Theological Commission to deal specifically with the theological issues. *The Theology of Christian Initiation* (1948) is the report of this Commission. Among the more important contributions to the discussion are: Gregory Dix, *The Theology of Confirmation in Relation to Baptism* (Dacre Press, 1946); G. C. Richards, *Baptism and Confirmation* (S. P. C. K. 1943); A. E. J. Rawlinson, *Christian Initiation* (S. P. C. K., 1947); W. F. Flemington, *The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism* (S. P. C. K., 1948); and G. W. H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit* (Longmans, 1951). Free Church

contributions include *The Sacrament of Baptism: Congregational Union of England and Wales* (Independent Press); *Infant Baptism Today* (Carey-Kingsgate Press); and E. A. Payne, *The Doctrine of Baptism* (Kingsgate Press, 1951), the latter two being Baptist statements. E. A. Payne's critique of Cullman's reply to Barth, "Cullman on Baptism," *Baptist Quarterly* (April, 1951), is also of some significance. A summary of the discussions among the Anglicans is given by the secretary of the Joint Committee on Baptism and Confirmation, F. C. Tindall, "Christian Initiation," *Church Quarterly Review* (April-June, 1951). He reports that the result is that "more emphasis is now put on Adult Baptism plus Confirmation as the norm of Christian Initiation, with the element of conscious response, in penitence and faith, as in the New Testament and primitive days," yet "Infant Baptism is defensible and justifiable" when completed by personal response in Confirmation. Of related interest to the present discussion of baptism is the Gorham case of the nineteenth century which has received fresh treatment in J. C. S. Nias, *Gorham and the Bishop of Exeter* (S.P.C.K., 1951).

Ever since the refusal of parliament in 1929 to approve the revision of the Prayer Book, church-state relations have constituted a critical problem for the Church of England. E. T. Davies, *Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy in the Church of England in the Seventeenth Century* (Basil Blackwood, 1952) describes the royal supremacy as the price the Church of England had to pay for her emancipation from the papacy, and yet it could be and was defended in terms of the Anglican ideal of a Christian Commonwealth. "In its connection with the modern state Anglicanism is running a very grave risk," but, asserts, Davies, "this connection may still prevent society from becoming completely secularized." F. J. Shirley, *Richard Hooker and Contemporary Political Ideas* (S.P.C.K., 1949) and C. F. Dirksen, *Critical Analysis of Richard Hooker's Theory of the Re-*

lation of Church and State (Notre Dame University, 1947) examine appreciatively Hooker's defense of the Anglican ideal of a Christian Commonwealth. Cyril Garbett, *Church and State in England* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1950) is a comprehensive survey of church-state relations in England, and the archbishop concludes that disestablishment may be the only honorable solution to the problem, but it is not to be sought. Less drastic action, which he suggests may be sufficient to resolve the tension, would

include a reform in the method of electing bishops, a revision of canon law and the system of church courts, and a modification of the procedure for securing liturgical change.

The publication of the *Bibliography of British History: The Eighteenth Century, 1714-1789*, ed. by Stanley Pargellis and D. J. Medley (Clarendon Press, 1951) is a welcome addition to the earlier volumes.

WINTHROP S. HUDSON

Colgate-Rochester Divinity School

BOOK REVIEWS

The Foundations of the Christian Faith. By J. N. SANDERS. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. xii + 199 pages. \$3.75

The purpose of this book is to "discuss the central doctrines of the New Testament in the light of historical criticism" (p.xi). The volume reflects the original form of the material, which was first given as popular lectures. It is the author's purpose to appeal not to professional theologians, but to students and lay teachers in the Church.

In his Introduction he emphasizes the necessity of historical criticism, and underlines the tremendous importance of the scholar's presuppositions. He points out how scholars of past generations have been led to their conclusions by such unexamined presuppositions, and proposes to find criteria that are fair to the content and claim of the New Testament itself.

Sanders recognizes the diversity in the thought and expression of New Testament writers, but finds a real unity in the fact that they all share loyalty to the Kerygma, the evangelistic message of the early church. This Kerygma is reflected in the Gospels as well as in Acts and the Epistles, and the Synoptic Gospels are rightly understood only in its light.

The section on the first theologians

states the causes of theological development, and traces the stages of that development in Paul, Hebrews, and the Fourth Gospel. The conclusion defines the Christian religion as "a man's total response to God as made known in and through Jesus Christ" (p. 185).

The book is essentially sound. Two questions arise: 1. Will the lay reader get enough from the brief sketches of historical criticism to understand its methods and rights? 2. The frequent references to the radical book by E. W. Barnes, *The Rise of Christianity*, will mean nothing to most readers, and might well have been omitted. The book is, however, a good combination of historical criticism and concern for Biblical theology.

FLOYD V. FILSON

McCormick Theological Seminary

A Social and Religious History of the Jews. By SALO WITTMAYER BARON. Second Edition, Revised and enlarged. Vols. I, II: *Ancient Times*, Parts I, II. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952. ix + 415; 493 pages. \$12.50.

Professor Baron of Columbia University here presents the first instalments of a revision of a work which first appeared in 1937. The first edition covered the whole of Jewish his-

tory in two volumes, with a third volume devoted to extensive Notes, Bibliography and Index. The revised edition, when complete, will fill seven volumes. These two initial volumes treat the period of Jewish history from its beginnings with the patriarchs to the close of the Talmudic period, about 500 A. D. The chapters are numbered consecutively in these two volumes, and the index is placed at the end of the second volume, but the notes are placed at the end of each volume. The revision is apparently so thorough that it virtually amounts to a new work.

This work has several merits. One is its comprehensiveness. Few scholars have attempted to cover the whole of Hebrew-Jewish history, and indeed few are capable of doing so. Comprehensiveness of this kind may lack depth at some points but one who knows the whole of the history is likely to have insights into some of the component parts that will escape specialists. Another merit is that Baron continually keeps in mind "social" factors in Jewish history. This is inevitable in dealing with a religion such as Judaism, which is a religion "of this world," believing that all of man's life comes under the will of God, and emphasizing social solidarity. Baron approaches his subject as a modern historian giving consideration to sociological and economic factors that are not always kept in mind by others. A third merit of this work is its bibliographical fullness. The notes are a veritable mine of references to books and articles in most modern languages, including Modern Hebrew. To scholars working in various fields of Jewish history this may well prove the most valuable feature of the work.

The first volume devotes a chapter to discussing the philosophy of Jewish history, and then proceeds to cover the Old Testament period almost to its close (though the organization is not strictly chronological). Here the author's point of view is that of well-informed "conservatism." In the Preface he speaks of the way in which scholarship in the last fifteen years has

thrown off the shackles of the Wellhausenian theory, which was still regnant in 1937. Baron presents a reconstruction of religious history different from that of Wellhausen, but he apparently still adheres to the hypothesis concerning the composition of the hexateuch which is associated with the name of Wellhausen (J, E, D, P). At any rate he offers nothing in the place of the hypothesis. He is willing to speak of Moses as a monotheist, and even of a pre-Mosaic "primitive monotheism."

While this reviewer feels more competent to criticize the first volume than the second, it is very probable that readers of *CHURCH HISTORY* will find the second more valuable and important for their purposes. This volume deals in part with the rise of Christianity, and the ultimate victory of Christianity with its adoption as the state religion. Two chapters, "The Great Schism" and "Closing the Ranks," should appeal to church historians, for here one can see the Jewish side of the history which produced Christianity and saw its conquest of the Roman empire. The author knows not only the Jewish sources, but the New Testament and the history of the Christian church.

The title of chapter X is significant: The Great Schism. According to Baron the schism which separated Christianity from Judaism occurred with Paul rather than with Jesus. The very earliest stage in Christianity was that of "the purely eschatological Palestinian community"; in this stage, "the new movement was hardly more than a sectarian current within Judaism, no more apart, for instance, than the Essenes." (II, 62-3) Baron can even say: "Jesus appears as an essentially Pharisaic Jew." (II, 67) The Christian Church really began with Paul. This is not a new conclusion. Significant, however, is Baron's remark that Paul's missionary successes among the Gentiles "entirely depended on the twilight situation of all the Hellenistic Jewish masses, from Syria to Rome." (II, 83) His journeys did not lead him to Babylonia or Egypt where

there were strong Jewish communities. Baron rightly points out that scholars ought, in seeking the Jewish antecedents of the Christian Church, to give more attention to Diaspora Judaism and the organization of its communities (II, 366).

Church historians should find interest in the author's discussion of the reasons why Judaism lost in the three-cornered struggle with paganism and Christianity. He seems to view the victory of Christianity as inevitable: "The synthesis of Judaism and the Graeco-Roman culture, in its religious reformation by Paul and his successors, was a great historical necessity." (II, 151) Some of the specific factors which account for the failure of Judaism, and conversely the success of Christianity, were: (1) The ambivalent attitude in Judaism toward proselytism. Pharisaic Judaism was a missionary religion, but the great success of early Christian missions among the "proselytic and semi-proselytic appendages of the Jewish communities in the Diaspora" discouraged later Judaism from missionary efforts (II, 147). (2) Judaism could not accept the idea of empire and had too deep an attachment to the Palestinian homeland. (3) Jewish worship was less attractive than Christian, for the Christian attitude toward the graphic arts was more flexible than the Jewish, and Jewish music was often sad and mournful by contrast with the joyous music of the pagans (borrowed by Christianity). (4) Christian literature in Greek and Latin was more abundant than the Jewish, and Christian use of the codex form of the book, rather than the traditional scroll form used by Jews, made Christian writings more popular and easier to handle.

J. PHILIP HYATT
Vanderbilt University

The Hebrew Scrolls from the Neighbourhood of Jericho and the Dead Sea. By G. R. DRIVER.
London: Oxford University Press, 1951, 52 pages.

The contents of this volume were delivered in 1950 as the fourth of the

Dr. Williams Lectures. It is one of a number of recent publications surveying the present state of study of the famous Dead Sea Scrolls discovered in 1947.

Driver introduces his study with a survey of the discovery and the contents of the cache of scrolls. He gives fleeting attention to the Isaiah and Habakkuk manuscripts belonging to St. Mark's Monastery, and the several scrolls of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. He writes before the full publication of the Scroll of Discipline, one of the most remarkable of the find, and knows nothing, of course, of a number of subsequent discoveries.

The weight of Professor Driver's work, more than one half of the book, is given over to a polemical defense of his positions on the date of the scrolls. He presses for a date toward 500 A. D., and if his attempts to show Arabic influence (!) on the language of the documents be taken seriously, a date as late as the seventh century A. D.

Driver arrives at this dating by a cavalier disregard for the evidence of paleography and archeology. This was an extraordinarily dubious procedure in 1950; it is an impossible one today. The findings of first-rank paleographers, who have maintained an early date (second-first centuries B. C. for the earliest of the scrolls) have been vindicated by (1) the late Hellenistic date of deposits found in the excavation of the "Scroll cave", (2) the dating of the linen wrappings of the scrolls by use of the radioactive carbon method (totally misunderstood in a hasty addition by Driver), and (3) new finds this year of dated documents of the second century B. C. at the end of the paleographic series. Either of the first two lines of evidence are decisive against Driver; the third in itself demonstrates the early date.

FRANK M. CROSS, JR.
McCormick Theological Seminary

What Is the Best New Testament? By ERNEST C. COLWELL.
Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1952. 127 pages. \$3.00.

The dust jacket of this little volume advertises its wares as "a thorough and lively survey of New Testament textual criticism by a distinguished Bible scholar." This is no overstatement in either respect. Dean Colwell's study will reassure any who were not aware that his administrative responsibilities during these last years had not eclipsed his continuing research. Moreover, here textual criticism leaves the seminar and enters the marketplace. Who but Colwell could liken the cross-breeding of manuscripts to a mixture of variously owned boxcars in a single freight train, or again to dresses "worn out, cut up, put into a scrap bag," only later to be made by frugal Christians into "patchwork quilts" using the same material for an entirely different pattern!

Under breezy captions, Dean Colwell tells the story of the search for the most reliable New Testament. From the first printing of the Greek New Testament in 1516 through the two-hundred-year reign of the Received Text, the quest is traced to the modern period with the establishment of critical texts relieved of medieval corruptions and reaching back to a much earlier period. Examples of the more significant textual variants and the use of the rules of criticism to determine the earliest reading in a given passage enrich the discussion.

It is in the discussion of modern views on the development and permutations of the New Testament text in its transmission and on the methods of criticism that the creative contribution of the book is made. Rejecting his earlier view, Dean Colwell now holds with many scholars that most of the variants in manuscripts were not the result of scribal carelessness nor of a pre-orthodox attitude toward the sacred text. They are actually intentional alterations introduced to correct a puzzling or difficult reading toward the theological persuasions of the scribe. Not verbal exactitude but rather the true meaning of the passage must be delineated. This reviewer has long been convinced that the vital

relationship between the form of the Sacred Book (textual criticism) and its doctrinal explication in the living community (historical theology) must be recognized and explored.

On the basis of a comparison of 17 translations in 64 passages in the Gospel of John, Colwell concludes that Goodspeed's translation is most faithful to the critical text of Westcott and Hort and hence is adjudged to be the most accurate English translation presently available. The RSV finishes the race in sixth place and is rebuked for its "unnecessary inconsistencies."

The non-specialist will find in this little book a thoroughly reliable and fascinating introduction to a textual science which seeks to recover the most accurate form of the New Testament text.

ERNEST W. SAUNDERS
Garrett Biblical Institute

The Uses of the Past. Profiles of Former Societies. By HERBERT J. MULLER. New York, Oxford University Press. 1952. XI + 394 pages. \$5.50.

The immediate inspiration of this book is Toynbee's *A Study of History*, and for us it is a matter for congratulation that Toynbee's work has called forth so stimulating a study by one who shows such wide interests, literary, philosophical, sociological, and historical. Here is no echo of Toynbee but a clear, independent, vigorous mind at work. The book comprises a series of studies of former societies, designed to give perspectives on the crisis of our own society. It is not a comprehensive survey of the history of civilization nor a complete interpretation of history, but is an effort "to counteract the popular simplicities that have been inspired by the complexities of our age and to discount the last words that are so freely uttered today," and is a plea for the understanding of the rudiments of universal history.

In general, Muller approaches history in the spirit of the great tragic

poets, a spirit of reverence and irony, based on the assumption that the tragic sense of life is not only the profoundest, but the most pertinent for an understanding of both past and present, and may be a positive inspiration. In particular he applies the method of irony, what he calls "the piety of deliberate impiety", and he stresses the ambiguities, incongruities and paradoxes of human history. The reader can best catch the spirit and method of the treatment by keeping in mind this avowed intention of the author and thus be saved from feeling that this is mere iconoclasm or striving after effect. There is no doubt about his seriousness of purpose and keenness of insight. The approach is that of the liberal and humanist. In effect the book is dedicated to the spirit of Athens and the liberal faith which has its roots in the Renaissance. Not all scholars and certainly not many theologians will agree with some of the basic assumptions yet all will be forced to face the issues that are raised, for the criticisms, though severe, are challenging.

The opening chapter gives an interesting account of the cathedral of St. Sophia, seen as the symbol of humility and pride, of holiness and worldliness, of the power of faith and the limitations of faith, and as a monument epitomizing all the great societies of the past which have failed, yet are not really dead for they have enriched the great tradition of high, enduring values. This is the recurrent theme throughout a penetrating analysis of the spirit and contribution of Israel, classical Greece, the Christian West, Holy Russia (Byzantine and Marxist), India and China.

The author is not optimistic about the prospects for the future but believes that the ideal values of Western civilization deserve to live and that the liberal faith—not prayer and a return to the "one true God" as Toynbee suggests—offers the only hope for a decent future. He suggests that as far as there is any solution it must be the result of education and creative thought, and the adventurous spirit which he identifies with humanism,

liberalism, rationalism, the scientific spirit, ideals of freedom, individualism and the "open society".

KENNETH H. COUSLAND
Emmanuel College, Toronto, Canada

The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmundian Constitutions. A Translation with Commentary, Glossary, and Bibliography. By CLYDE PHARR, in collaboration with Theresa Sherrer Davidson and Mary Brown Pharr. With an Introduction by C. Dickerman Williams. Princeton University Press. 1952. xxvi + 643 pages. \$20.00.

This magnificent volume is the first in a projected series of translations of the whole body of source material of Roman Law. The work has been in progress since 1930, and the first fruits of the venture represent the labors of many scholars collaborating with the general editor, Dr. Pharr. Publication has been made possible by generous grants made by Vanderbilt University, the Carnegie Foundation, the American Council of Learned Societies, and Mr. C. Dickerman Williams of the New York Bar. This will undoubtedly be one of the greatest projects of translation and commentary of basic source materials in our century.

The translation of the Theodosian Code and Novels—the first to appear in any modern language—is based upon the text of Mommsen and Mayer, published in 1905. The bombastic language of much of the original has been literally rendered in smooth English, and copious notes, comments, and cross references assist the student in clarifying the meaning of the text. Where the rubrics of the Code are incomplete or in error the notes provide the best opinions of modern scholarship. Moreover a glossary of technical terms and a detailed index aid substantially in finding one's way through the Code. In addition to brief introductions giving the historical background, there is a chronological table of Roman Emperors, a select bibliography, and a map showing the

dioceses and provinces of the Empire in the late fourth century. All in all this is just about as perfect a book of its kind that any scholar and student could hope to have.

The Code was ordered by Theodosius II in 429 and completed by two successive commissions in 438. It embodies the edicts and general constitutions of Emperors from Constantine onwards. It is not complete, and many of the materials are abridged, rarely altered. Even so, it remains our primary source for the legal history of the Empire in the fourth and fifth centuries, in all the manifold phases of life, political, economic, social and religious. The interpretations of the laws that appear in the manuscripts are the opinions of jurists between the publication of the Code and the abridgement of it in the *Breviarium* of Alaric II in 529, compiled by the Visigothic King for his Roman subjects. In the East, the Code was superseded, of course, by Justinian's codification in 529.

In addition to the Code, properly speaking, the present work includes supplementary documents generally edited with it. First of all, there are the *Sirmondian Constitutions*, named for their first editor, Jacques Sirmond, in 1631. These are sixteen Constitutions which antedate the Code and contain valuable material not included in it—much of it ecclesiastical legislation. Post-Theodosian Novels of the Emperors from 438 to 468 are also provided. These include the famous rescript of Valentinian III in 445 on the primacy of the Roman See.

The Code itself is divided into sixteen books, and in each book the laws are arranged chronologically. The first five books treat of civil law, and books VI-VIII with political administration. Book IX deals with criminal law, books X-XI with fiscal law, and books XII-XV with the varied problems of urban administration and corporations. The last book is devoted entirely to legislation on religion—the rights and privileges of churches and clerics, monks, penalties of heretics and apostates, repression of paganism,

etc. The index, however, gives ample leads to legislation affecting the Church in other books of the Code. Heretofore only a partial amount of this material has been available in English, in the thesis of Maude A. Huttman, *The Establishment of Christianity and the Proscription of Paganism* (Columbia University Press, 1914), pp. 136-249.

It is not necessary to remind *Church History* readers of the importance of this source material. It is primary in every sense of the term, both for the study of the establishment of Christianity as the state religion after Constantine, and also for the social background from which monasticism developed and through which the great Fathers of the Church formulated the creeds and canons that underly both Eastern Orthodoxy and Latin Catholicism. It was the law that the barbarian tribes found and used in their earliest attempts to reconstruct western society out of the chaos created by their own migrations.

The reasonable cost of this volume, so slight in comparison to its great value, makes it imperative that every theological library acquire and make available to students this indispensable source.

MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR.
Episcopal Theological School

Tavistock Abbey: A Study in the Social and Economic History of Devon. By H. P. R. FINBERG. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1952. viii + 320 pages. \$5.00.

In 1920 the late G. G. Coulton inaugurated the series known as the *Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought*. His own absorbing *Five Centuries of Religion* was included in the fourteen volumes published. Now the series has been revived under the editorship of Professor David Knowles. The first two volumes of this New Series are E. Miller's *The Abbey and Bishopric of Ely* and the present study of Tavistock Abbey by Herbert Finberg, one of the younger

and more promising of English Medievalists.

Finberg's work is a comprehensive treatment of a region long neglected by historians, economists and archaeologists; a neglect that is strange as Devonshire is the third largest county of England and a conservative area where old regional habits and customs have survived and persisted. As the title indicates, the study is concerned with the social and economic history of that part of Devon which comprised the ecclesiastical benefices and the territorial estates of Tavistock Abbey. The religious activities and the spiritual life of this Benedictine community are thus accorded scant treatment.

Tavistock Abbey, dedicated to Our Lady and the Cornish Saint Ruman, was founded in 961, received its charter in 981, and prospered until its dissolution in March, 1539. Its long history and its diversified economic interests and activities make an economic and social study of this rich abbey of special importance and a very valuable contribution to an understanding of medieval England. Finberg's descriptions and analyses of the fisheries, the tin mines or stannaries, the fairs and markets, the arable and pastoral husbandry, and the seignorial revenues are interesting, detailed, and show the thoroughness of his intensive research. The results of numerous monographs and articles, many his own, are incorporated in the narrative, and thirty tables give detailed statistics of such items as the amount of grain and dairy produce, the price of wool and oxen, the output of the mines, and the weekly wages of the permanent staff.

The chapter on the complicated social structure on the Tavistock estates is especially enlightening and informative. The emancipation of slaves, for example, is shown to have been slow in Devonshire where the Domesday inquest of 1086 lists over 5,000, twenty-six per cent of the enumerated population. Also contrary to the evidence from the midland and southern England, there seems to have been in

Devonshire no general depression of the free peasantry in the centuries immediately following the Norman conquest.

A folding map of the former parish of Tavistock, a drawing depicting in perspective a reconstruction of the now ruined abbey, and an aerial photograph showing the present aspect of the site are appended and add to the attractiveness of this generally excellent work.

KARL H. DANNENFELDT

Elmira College

The White Canons in England. By H. M. COLVIN. New York: Oxford University Press, 1952. viii + 459 pages. \$7.00.

It is perhaps not without significance that our troubled times should be witnessing a revival of interest in the religious life of past centuries. To the fast-growing body of literature on medieval monasticism Mr. Colvin's study of the English Premonstratensians is a distinguished contribution. While lacking the lustre of Cluny, Cîteaux, or Chartreuse, the Order of Prémontré claims our attention as a unique combination of the contemplative and the pastoral, the ascetic and the evangelistic. Its rule was an unstable amalgam of the Augustinian *vita canonica* and the Cistercian *carta caritatis*. In western Europe the contemplative element predominated: not so in the Wendish mission, to which Norbert of Xanten called his followers on his becoming Archbishop of Magdeburg a few years after the foundation. Colvin makes clear the debt which Norbert and the White Canons owed to St. Bernard. Indeed, at several points there is a circumstantial approximation to Cistercian usages and ideals: the white habit, the capitular organization, affiliation, lay brothers, the distribution of 'obedientary' authority, etc. In the next century, St. Dominic was in turn to borrow from the rule of Prémontré.

By the middle of the twelfth century—thirty years after the founding

of Prémontré—the Norbertine houses numbered nearly a hundred. In England, thirty-three were established within a century and a quarter between the anarchy of Stephen and the time of Henry III and Grosseteste (no particular friend, by the way, of the White Canons). Toward a more effective discipline the Premonstratensians supplemented the Cistercian system of filiation with a regional grouping into *circariae* (three in England) under visiting abbots (*circatores*).

The history of the Order is marked by a series of tensions: first between the ascetic-contemplative ideal and pastoral activities (the White Canons commonly exercised the cure of souls within their appropriated parish churches); then by a struggle on the part of the English daughter-houses to throw off the control of Prémontré. This effort, begun under nationalistic pressure from the secular power (*temp.* Edward I), was carried farther by the divided ecclesiastical allegiance resulting from papal schism. Right down to the dissolution the English abbots and *circatores* enjoyed a large measure of freedom from overseas interference.

The first of Colvin's seven chapters is an admirable sketch of the founding, spread, and inner development of the Premonstratensian Order. The long second chapter, nearly half the text, is devoted to the history of the 33 English houses of the White Canons. There is a wealth of appended documentary material of diverse content.

PERCY V. NORWOOD
Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

The Knowledge of God in Calvin's Theology. By EDWARD A. DOWEY, JR. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952. xii + 261 pages. \$3.75.

This treatise is a doctoral dissertation presented at the University of Zurich by the author.

There has been lacking in the Calvin literature an adequate and exhaustive

study of Calvin's concept of faith, which the reviewer in agreement with the author considers the key concept of the *Institutes* and of Calvin's thought generally. In a scholarly but readable form, Dr. Doweey now has partly filled this gap by providing us with a competent study of the epistemological significance of faith. The author uses besides Calvin's writings the works of Warfield, Lobstein, Gloede, Peter Barth, Peter Brunner, and others. He has overlooked, however, two sources of importance for his topic: Simon Pieter Dee's *Het Geloofsbegrip van Calvin* and Wilhelm Kolfhaus' *Christusgemeinschaft bei Johannes Calvin*.

Doweey's work is limited to a study of faith as an instrument of the knowledge of God the Creator and Redeemer. He does not presume to give an exhaustive study of the nature and effects of faith. In the first part, the author deals with (1) how God accommodates his revelation to human finiteness and sinfulness, (2) how the knowledge of God is indissolubly correlated with the knowledge of ourselves, (3) the fact that the knowledge of God is that of personal encounter, and (4) the objective clarity and comprehensibility of the knowledge when the noetic effects of sin are ignored.

The body of the text deals with what are the two different parts of the knowledge of God and, at the same time, of the underlying doctrinal structure of the *Institutes*: the knowledge of God the Creator, and the knowledge of God the Redeemer. The knowledge of God the Creator comes from (1) the *sensus divinitatis*, (2) conscience, (3) the structure of the external world, and (4) the special revelation in Scripture, which is authenticated only by the *testimonium internum Spiritus Sancti*. The author judges that Calvin means that this revelation of God the Creator is unavailable without a previous knowledge in faith of God the Redeemer (pp. 46, 72-73, 82-83, 147). In his discussion of Calvin's understanding of Scripture, Doweey argues at length

(pp. 92-105) that the Reformer held to the theory that there was an errorless, literal dictation by God of the original texts of Scripture.

The second part of the *duplex cognitio Domini* is the knowledge of the Redeemer. Faith's knowledge is not of *Deus apud se* but of *Deus erga nos*, God accommodating himself to men in Christ. The experience of faith is a wholly gratuitous one. The marks of faith are the illumination of the mind and the certain persuasion of mind and heart under the inspiration of the Spirit. The knowledge of faith consists, further, in a mystical union with Christ in which the believer personally experiences the love of God turned toward him. The knowledge which faith brings is therefore the beginning of participation in eternal life.

The author correlates the parts of the *duplex cognitio Domini* with Calvin's twofold understanding of the law (as created perfection, as divine will abrogated by the Fall). The two parts of the knowledge of God are thus only brought into a somewhat tenuous relationship to one another; for "the believer can never build a continuous thought structure relating the creating and redeeming work of God, because of the mystery of gratuitous love that lies behind both and the noetic effects of sin." (p. 238)

Dowey has ably come to grips with the central issue in this matter of the knowledge of God, namely, the understanding of faith as a cognitive transaction. The reviewer believes that Calvin intends that a third mark of faith, the sealing of the will or heart (*obsignatio*), be placed alongside of *illuminatio* and *certitudo*. This mark prevents the objection that *vera fides* differs from *fides implicita* only in its degree of clarity and certainty. It further indicates that the knowledge of faith is that of personal rapport (as Dowey admits) rather than a pure matter of intellection. It helps make understandable the fact that the knowledge of faith consists in a *unio mystica*. The reviewer cannot agree with the author's tendency to subsume *fiducia*

under the certainty of *fides* (p. 192). In Calvin's considered definitions of faith, the term *fiducia* does not appear. Further *fiducia* is never referred to as bearing the marks listed above for faith. It is not a constituent of faith; it is an effect of faith, a movement of the will, on the basis of the certainty of the knowledge conveyed by faith.

It would have been worthwhile if the author had taken some space to point up the significance of Calvin's epistemology by way of contrasting it to the classical forms of rationalism and empiricism. The result of such a contrast is to confront men with a rather clear-cut issue: either no real knowledge of God is possible, because the only means of inquiry at the disposal of men are logical or empirical; or, such knowledge is possible, because there is given to men another means of knowing, faith, which is unconditioned by human facilities for thought and action. Only faith can break down the egocentric predicament. This proposition expresses the issue of Calvin's theory of knowledge.

WALTER E. STUERMANN
University of Tulsa

The Life and Works of Joseph Hall 1574-1656. By T. F. KINLOCH. London and New York: Staples Press. 1952. 210 pages. \$4.00.

This book leaves the reader wondering why it was undertaken. Not that a book with this title need be superfluous: it is 65 years since Lewis's biography, and enough work has since been done on Hall to justify a new study. From the point of view of formal literary history there would not seem to be much need for re-emphasizing Hall's achievement; whenever the origins of English satire, epistle, and character-writing are discussed, there is sure to be some acknowledgement of the contribution of "that inevitable pioneer," as Professor Douglas Bush has called Hall. In other ways, however, Hall's interest for us is worth re-examining. Modern

editing has greatly increased his utility as a sourcebook for contemporary life and manners. The revival of interest in the Laudian church, the close scrutiny of Milton's polemical activity, and the florescence of research into the Puritan Revolution, all combine to suggest that a new study of Hall's life and works would be timely and appropriate.

The question is why Mr. Kinloch should have undertaken it. It cannot have been a labor of love: Mr. Kinloch appears to dislike his subject very much. He calls him a hard man (20), an imputer of evil motives (20), an egoist (21), weak of character (34), obsequious (155), never ingenuous (156). His denunciation of Hall for slandering Milton may be no more than justice requires (although the language suggests that he finds some pleasure in handling justice's whip: "vile and entirely unwarranted," "wicked and malicious," "venomous"). But the general impression left upon the reader is that where Hall does not furnish Mr. Kinloch with real sins worthy of his lash, some will be manufactured. For example, Hall is "insincere." The ground: in the dedication of his *Meditations and vows* Hall (he was then thirty) had called the work an "unworthy scrawl." But "a sincere man who felt that his book was an 'unworthy scrawl' would not have published it" (86).

If Mr. Kinloch did not take up this work out of affection for his subject, neither did he out of a conviction of his importance. From time to time he dutifully asserts that such-and-such a thing of Hall's matters; but he does not really believe it. What he really believes is that if Milton had not attacked him, "Joseph Hall would have been long since forgotten" (164). Indeed, he cannot always conceal his boredom with what he is doing. He feels obliged to "deal with" Hall's meditations, but his sense of fairness to the reader makes him say first that "no reader will miss much if he passes them by altogether" (92).

And in fact, as he emerges from

this treatment, Hall seems wholly unimportant and rather a bore. This startling and improbable result is due in good measure to Mr. Kinloch's method. The works are examined, not in chronological sequence, but according to kind; a chapter each goes to sermons, contemplations, meditations, "miscellany," controversies, "literary works." There is thus no sense of development, either in Hall or in the great struggle in which he was a leading contender. One looks in vain for any sense of Hall's drama, replete with tragic irony (despite his early Puritan sympathies, it was he who first, in print, abandoned Hooker's great permissive theory of episcopacy for the prescriptive theory which made compromise impossible). What interest might somehow have survived this unchronological treatment is disposed of by the quality and manner of Mr. Kinloch's commentary. There is rarely any sustained analysis; in its stead there are disjunctive observations (usually labelled a, b, etc.) and dreary catalogues of Hall's "sentences," ideas, opinions, etc. (usually numbered, and often going beyond 20).

Mr. Kinloch's preface renders thanks to someone who read his proofs. Like Hamlet's, his thanks are too dear a halfpenny. The author of *Milton's contemporary reputation* is twice cited as "Roper" (161). Arithmetic can be as unaccountable as nomenclature: "Between 373 and 284 B. C. . . . there lived in Athens a man called Theophrastus. He . . . produced a fascinating little book in his ninety-ninth year."

ERNEST SIRLUCK

University of Chicago

Grundtvig. An Introduction. By P. G. LINDHART. London: S. P. C. K. 1951. 144 pages. 21s.

Of half a dozen brief treatments of Grundtvig in English this is easily the best, and is, despite its brevity, to be used beside the German study by E. Lehmann which has hitherto been the refuge of those lacking Danish. Dr. Lindhart, professor of church history

at Aarhus, has made available many of the results of the renaissance of Grundtvig studies of the last half generation. To this research he has made some contributions himself, especially in the Grundtvigian conception of the church and church-state relations, and in his extended study of the Grundtvigian Morten Pontoppidan. Grundtvig's relations with England are stressed in the present sketch. Dr. Lindhardt utilizes especially the researches of Toldberg, but has been himself investigating Grundtvig's relations with the Cambridge Coleridgeans and promises an essay in *Studia Theologica* on Grundtvig and F. D. Maurice.

As to the place of Grundtvig in theological history, Professor Lindhardt agrees with those who consider him less of a romanticist and essentially akin to Luther. He even maintains that "in reality Grundtvig's and Kierkegaard's concerns and intentions are the same," i.e., those of existentialism. His analysis of Grundtvig's peculiar conceptions of church and state relations, its motives and its affinities to the views of Thomas Arnold and Coleridge is especially illuminating. And the distinctive character of Grundtvig's catholicism is clearly compared and contrasted with that of Pusey and Newman on matters of ministerial order and sacraments. Since the bulk of the available literature in English has primary reference to the Folk School movement, Professor Lindhardt sketches this rapidly, noting, however, that Grundtvig's original theories on the relation of the Christian to the natural man actually had little influence on the schools as they developed along more uncompromisingly "Christian" lines. The whole impact of Grundtvig in Danish life in the last one hundred years is assayed judiciously.

J. H. NICHOLS

University of Chicago

Heavens on Earth: Utopian Communities in America 1680-1880.

By MARK HOLLOWAY. New York:

Library Publishers, 1951. 240 pages. \$4.75.

Tucked away on the very last page of the text of this book is the clue which explains the particular slant with which the author has treated his subject. He writes, "... my greatest debt is to Ernest Sutherland Bates. Without the *American Faith* of that accomplished social historian, this book would have lacked such historical perspective as it may contain."

In a way it is unfortunate that this ascription did not precede the text for it might there have prepared the reader for the noticeable anti-clerical and anti-ecclesiastical bias which one might well anticipate from a disciple of the Bates school of interpretation. On the other hand it is perhaps fortunate that it did not come at the start because then it would have held out a hope for a well-rounded and integrated socio-economic interpretation of the communities involved, and this would have been a hope which fails of fulfillment.

The author follows the Bates bias but without the prudence and agility which marked the master himself. The bias comes out too strongly and unguardedly when the phrase "perversion of Christ's teaching" is applied to Luther and Zwingli (p. 17), or again when the author roundly declares on p. 31 that the Undertakers of the Plymouth Colony, "speedily transformed themselves into an oligarchy, thus preparing the ground for that famous Bostonian authoritarianism which reached its peak . . . with Cotton Mather's Salem witchcraft trials," thus attributing to both Plymouth and Mather much more than the facts will validate. Similarly William Penn is credited with having guaranteed "complete religious toleration" in his colony, an illusion which Sanford Cobb long ago dispelled, and the "detestation" of Johann Jacob Zimmermann for the clergy is averred "later to have embraced the larger part of humanity." It would seem that Mr. Holloway has indeed followed Bates, but not too wisely nor too well.

On the other hand one could wish for a fuller implementation of the Bates theories as to the socio-economic bases of religious organization and expressions when Mr. Holloway gets into his treatment of the actual communities. Here he seems to discard the Bates interpretation as he goes into a somewhat superficial, run of the mill description of the communities. The reader will look in vain for the depth of perception and excellence of interpretation which mark *American Faith*.

The treatments of the communities involved are interesting, readable, popular accounts. The author is markedly harsh in his treatment of some of the groups, notably those which employed celibacy, a phenomenon to which he seems unable to give full credence. In treating these groups he frequently lapses into statements which are at the least snide and at the worst suggestive. Other groups are given markedly sympathetic treatment. His handling of the religiously based com-

munities never manages to grasp the full significance of the religious motivations.

In addition to its readability, the book provides a comprehensive coverage of all the communities which rose in the years 1680 to 1880. The numerous pictures add to its attractiveness. It will serve as an introduction to these communities.

The Bibliographical note indicates that the author has used practically all the available secondary sources and a limited number of the primary sources. He seems not to have touched the extensive supply of periodical material which is accessible. It is surprising to observe that he either does not know, or has not used, the most recent treatment of these communities, *Where Angels Dared to Tread*, by V. F. Calverton, who, interestingly enough, was another disciple of Bates and dedicated his book to him.

RICHARD C. WOLF
Oberlin School of Theology

Minutes of the Society

President Sanford Fleming called the seventy-second meeting of the society to order at 9:00 P. M. on June 9, 1952 in Norton Hall at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary at Louisville, Kentucky. Loefferts Loetscher led in the opening prayer. The minutes for the previous spring meeting held April 20, 1951 were approved as printed in *CHURCH HISTORY*, September, 1951. The secretary reported the election of 34 new members. (See minutes of the Council).

This meeting was held at the invitation of the American Association of Theological Seminaries at the time of their annual meeting, and a large number of members and guests were in attendance.

The society voted to accept a goal of one hundred new members by December, 1952.

During the course of the meeting the following papers were read:

"Puritan Radicalism and Mysticism" by Jerald Brauer

"Recent Excavations at St. Peter's in Rome" by Charles C. Boldrick

"Historical Myths Are Born" by F. D. Nichol

"Some Early Kentucky Church Experiences" by Howard E. Short

"Trends in American Church History" was the subject discussed by a panel chaired by Dean Howard Hopkins, and including Professors Loetscher of Princeton, Handy of Union, Brauer and Mead of Chicago.

The relation of the historian's Christian presuppositions to his procedure was treated by several of the speakers. On the one hand it was argued that positivism in historical method was no longer tenable, and that church historians should be aware of their own presuppositions as to what "church" means. On the other hand it was noted that to date American church history

has not been written with any such clear definition of its subject matter, but largely by sociologists or literary historians, and it was feared that an a priori doctrine, derived from the New Testament or the Reformation, might be imposed on American church life with little profit.

Most of the specific themes discussed related to nineteenth and twentieth century developments, the speakers apparently agreeing that the earlier period had been more satisfactorily interpreted. It was noted that sectional differences had not been sufficiently observed, that East-West tensions in church life should be explored, and that most of the generalizations currently applied to the church history of the recent period have been derived from the North East and are applicable only in small part to the South. Of those generalizations on the post-Civil War period Schlesinger's were cited as most helpful, but were criticized as neglecting the dynamism of church life and finding all the effective forces for change outside the churches. The "frontier" thesis was subjected to the same criticism, and also to the fault of unduly isolating American Christianity from that of Europe. A more adequate attention to Christian thought in America, it was felt, would bring American church history back into its proper relationship to Christendom. Revivalism, e. g. had scarcely been treated theologically. And the history of worship was yet to be undertaken. The role of Christianity in shaping the American sense of mission and destiny in the world was also suggested as a theme for further explorations. Or to turn it about, the theme of the "Americanization" of European church traditions (e. g. Lutheran, Anglican) provides a means of defining the American situation in its pe-

culiarities. Special topics as yet inadequately treated are the histories of the American Roman Catholics, and the Negro denominations.

In the way of tools for teaching and research it was urged that a source book of about two volume compass should be compiled. The standard bibliographies of American church history need revision. And there is the problem of the scattered sources, especially for 19th century church history, such as religious periodicals. Can some organized microfilming be undertaken?

Attest: RAYMOND W. ALBRIGHT
Secretary

Minutes of the Council

The Council of the Society met in Norton Hall at the Southern Baptist Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, at 4:00 P. M., June 9, 1952, with President Sanford Fleming presiding. Other members of the Council in attendance were Sidney Mead, J. H. Nichols, Carl Schneider, George Williams, and Raymond W. Albright. The minutes were approved as printed in *CHURCH HISTORY* for September, 1951.

For the editors James H. Nichols reported the publication of the Brewer Prize Essay by Franklin H. Littell. The Council approved the proposal that the Brewer prize funds be divided, \$275.00 to the Berne Witness Company and \$200.00 to the author in compensation for delays. Attention was called to the increase of 10% in the printing costs of *CHURCH HISTORY*. In the light of this increase the Council voted to request the society to undertake to secure one hundred new members by December, 1952.

The Council voted to send greetings and good wishes for speedy recovery

to Theodore Bachman, who was injured in an automobile accident at Lima, Ohio, *en route* to this meeting where he was to have read a paper.

The following persons, properly nominated, were elected as members of the society subject to the constitutional provisions:

William G. Baker
Colman J. Barry
Virginia Nellie Bellamy
Robert Bowman
M. F. Carpenter
Kenneth Carroll
Robert E. Cushman
Guy M. Davis, Jr.
George Delp
Donn Michael Farris
Carl Vernon Harris
Irvine J. Harrison
Jay Kieffer
H. H. Kimber
Charles D. Krug
Malcolm McCallum
R. C. McMillan
Robert S. Michaelson
Dale Miller
Perry Miller
Rudolph V. Nemser
John W. Neth, Jr.
Kenneth Plummer
Kermit D. Pugh
William C. Roeger
Ernest Sirluck
Karl Frederick Solberg
Arvel M. Steece
Walter D. Wagoner
Dee Walburn
John R. Weinlick
Arthur P. Whitney
H. F. Woodhouse
Paul S. Yoder

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 P. M.

Attest: RAYMOND W. ALBRIGHT
Secretary

in-
at
ing
.rly
ers
tu-

5:30
IGHT